



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

P. 1419 e 1678



THE
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW:
A JOURNAL
OF
RELIGIOUS THOUGHT AND LIFE.

"Our fathers worshiped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." * * *

"The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. * * * But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." (John iv. 20, 21, 23, 24.)

VOL. III. Nos. XII.—XV.

LONDON:
WILLIAMS & NORGATE, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN,
AND AT 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.
MANCHESTER: JOHNSON & RAWSON, 89, MARKET STREET.

1866.

THE THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. XII.—JANUARY, 1866.

I.—THE PROPHET ISAIAH.

WE once heard the present Bishop of Salisbury preach, in his own cathedral, from a text in the thirty-fifth chapter of Isaiah. The sermon would by many have been termed eloquent, being well composed, and delivered with the due intermixture of emphasis and earnestness. It was, in substance, an exposition of the supposed evangelical purport of that beautiful chapter. The preacher took it for granted throughout that the burden of the prophecy is the coming of Christ and the spiritual glories of his kingdom—in accordance, of course, with the interpretation so conveniently at hand for episcopal use in the heading of the chapter, as it stands in an ordinary English Bible. The literal, or historical, meaning of the words, as an exalted poetical description of the return home of the captive Jews from Babylon, seemed to have no interest, or no existence, for the bishop, even if it were at all glanced at, as a sort of primary and carnal sense, altogether unworthy to be thought of now. For us Christians, the whole is simply a prophecy, plainly worded too, of the future triumphs of the gospel—nothing more, and nothing less. The discourse was, in short, such as did not fail to excite the surprise of one, at least, of the audience. We could not help wondering whether the time would ever come, when those who profess to hold the Bible in reverence as the inspired word of God would take the trouble to ascertain its meaning before standing up to teach the people from it; and whether the people themselves would always look up, with such patient, respectful defer-

ence, to such marvellous exhibitions of unreasoning prejudice or ignorance in high places.

A mind not unduly pre-occupied with any theory of "prophecy," would probably have no hesitation in recognizing that the chapter we have named and the one which precedes it ought to be taken together as one whole, both because the literary style is the same throughout, and because they relate to one and the same great subject. This is manifestly the overthrow of the enemies of the Jews, and the accompanying or consequent release of the latter from captivity, followed by their triumphant return home to their own land. This event is so clearly indicated, that it would seem to be impossible even for the most determined expounder of evangelical meanings to shut his eyes to it. The last verse of the section is especially plain :

"And the ransomed of Jehovah shall return,
And come to Zion with songs,
And everlasting joy upon their heads ;
They shall obtain gladness and joy,
And sorrow and sighing shall flee away" (xxxv. 10).

The contents of the preceding chapter are equally clear. The nations—yea, all the world—are called upon to come near and behold the destruction that has fallen upon "all nations." This latter expression can only denote some great power made up of many various nationalities, as we know the Babylonian empire to have been. These shall be (or have been) destroyed—

"For the indignation of Jehovah is upon all the nations,
And his anger upon all their armies :
He hath devoted them to destruction,
He hath delivered them to the slaughter" (xxxiv. 2).

But, in the manner of an ancient prophet, the sacred writer does not forget the nearer enemies of his people. The same destruction which has fallen upon the empire of the Babylonians shall visit the land of Edom and its inhabitants :

"For Jehovah hath a sacrifice in Bozrah,
And a great slaughter in the land of Edom.
And the buffaloes shall be brought down with them,
And the bullocks with the bulls ;
And their land shall be bathed in blood,
And their dust soaked with fat.

For a day of vengeance hath Jehovah,
A year of recompences, for the defence of Zion" (xxxiv. 6—8).

The remainder of the thirty-fourth chapter probably refers exclusively to Edom; or it may be that both Edom and Babylon are equally included within the prophetic denunciation. The Edomites had incurred the lasting hatred of the Hebrews by the course they had formerly taken. Ezekiel (xxv. 12—14), Obadiah (v. 10), and some other expressions in the Prophets, shew us that, at the time of the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, the Edomites had taken part with the invading enemy. But all this shall, for the time at least, be forgotten by the exiled people in their own deliverance. The very wilderness shall be glad at their return. The desert sands through which they journey shall rejoice in unwonted verdure. The thirsty soil shall yield springs of water for the refreshment of the pilgrims, and the route shall be so plain and so safe that wayfaring men, though fools, shall not go astray upon it. The conception and wording of this chapter are so similar to what is several times met with in the latter part of the book of Isaiah, as directly to suggest the conclusion that the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth chapters are very closely related to the large section formed by the last twenty-seven chapters. In the forty-first, forty-third, fifty-fifth chapters, and elsewhere in that section, we meet with the same poetical anticipation of the ease and joy with which the march through the desert shall be accomplished, everywhere in terms indicative of a common authorship. In short, we may conclude that these two chapters have been accidentally separated, by some ancient arranger, from their proper position in the latter part of the book; and there is no sufficient reason, as we think, for supposing that they are not from the same hand as those final chapters. This remark of course we make with all due respect to those authorities who hold that the two chapters in question are by a different author.

The subject, however, of the origin and position of this short section of Isaiah is one of very minor interest. It is a far larger and more important question, whether several other considerable portions of the book, and in particular the last twenty-seven chapters, are all of one age; or whether, in fact, the whole book, earlier and later chapters alike (ex-

cepting perhaps the historical appendix, xxxvi.—xxxix.), be the literary production of one and the same author, and that author the prophet Isaiah. Our readers are, of course, aware how this question has been answered by all the leading Hebrew scholars of Germany in recent times, from Eichhorn downwards. We propose to state, in a brief form, some of the principal grounds on which rests the negative answer which they have so unanimously given; not entering, however, into any minute details of Hebrew criticism, but confining ourselves within the limits of a more simple and popular statement.

It will assist us in the discussion, if we first take notice of the period in which Isaiah lived, and point out such prophecies of his as are admitted by most of the modern expositors of note to be of tolerably certain authenticity.

The age in which the prophet flourished is stated at the commencement of the book. It was the period of the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah. The reigns of the second and third of these kings comprise the interval from 759 to 728 B.C., about thirty years. Isaiah probably began his ministry as a prophet near the close of Uzziah's reign, as we may gather from the sixth chapter, in which he speaks of what appears to be his first entrance upon the prophetic office. Supposing that he were thirty years of age at this time, he would be about sixty at the death of Ahaz, and may have lived on many years into the reign of Hezekiah. That he did so, may be learnt with certainty from the narratives of the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters, from which it appears that he must have been connected with king Hezekiah for some considerable time.* An ancient tradition represents him as having lived till after the accession of Manasseh, Hezekiah's idolatrous son and successor, who came to the throne about 699 B.C., and as having been put to death by this king. Of this it is enough to say that it cannot be verified, or traced to any sufficient historical authority. It is probable that Isaiah's usual residence was in or near Jerusalem, as he often speaks

* According to the judgment of the best modern critics, the four chapters, xxxvi.—xxxix., are an appendix to the book of Isaiah, but not from the pen of the prophet. The mention of the death of Sennacherib (xxxvii. 38) is inconsistent with the supposition that he was the author. It is unnecessary here to enter into the minuter details of the question.

of that city, and addresses its people, or classes of its citizens, as in his first, third, twenty-ninth chapters.

The prophet lived, it is evident, in an eventful period of Jewish history. A subject of the kingdom of Judah, it is with that kingdom and its affairs that his prophecies are chiefly concerned; though he does not wholly refrain from speaking of the neighbouring kingdom of Israel, as we see in the ninth, seventeenth and twenty-eighth chapters.

Although, as we have said, Isaiah's ministry commenced so early as the reign of Uzziah, yet we have only a single chapter remaining which appears to belong to this period. This is the sixth chapter; and we cannot of course be sure that it was written in the year of which it speaks, that of the death of the king. Indeed, the desponding tone of the latter part of the chapter, and the announcement of coming calamity as the consequence of the obstinate sins of his people, may be taken to indicate a later date of composition; one, namely, when the prophet had already had a lengthened experience of his nation and their rulers, and had become too well acquainted with their hardness of heart and slowness to take warning. Yet, on the whole, the chapter may be considered to indicate correctly the time when the writer first felt himself impelled to enter upon his prophetic career.

The first twelve chapters of Isaiah are admitted to be the oldest part of the collection, and to be wholly made up of authentic prophecies, with the exception, perhaps, of ch. ii. 2—4, which is found not only here, but also in the book of Micah, and which both that prophet and Isaiah probably adopted, not one from the other, but rather each from some elder predecessor. If these chapters formed the original collection, the inscription at the head of the first chapter no doubt belonged to that, in the first instance. Then, after various additions had been made, the same inscription would come to stand at the head of a larger collection; and it serves, appropriately enough, to introduce the whole.

These twelve chapters, it will be seen at once, all relate entirely to the Hebrew people or their enemies, and the political circumstances of the time. They set forth the sins of Judah and Israel, the condemnation and punishment which these brought down, as manifested in the invasion and desolation of the country, and the starvation or capti-

vity of various classes of its inhabitants. But in the midst of these announcements, the prophet does not fail to hold fast his religious trust. Jehovah will not utterly desert or cast off His people; but after the period of punishment has passed, He will shew Himself merciful. Their enemies of Syria and Assyria shall be destroyed, while there shall spring forth a new and vigorous shoot from the stem of Jesse, and a branch from his roots, who shall rule the nation in wisdom and peace, shall prevail over their enemies, and rescue the captive outcasts of Judah from the four corners of the earth (ch. xi.). The two kingdoms of Israel and Judah shall in these anticipated days of prosperity be re-united, and shall be powerful enough to attack and humble their ancient enemies of Edom and Ammon, Moab and Egypt. Even the remnant left in Assyria shall be enabled to return home, and join in singing the song of praise to Jehovah, the God of their salvation (ch. xii.).

In the prophecies thus brought together in one primitive collection, two things now deserve our more particular notice:—*First*, the fact that they all relate to the immediate circumstances of Isaiah's own time,—the actual condition, social and political, moral and religious, of the prophet's own people. The idolatries, oppressions and deeds of blood, of which he speaks, are those immediately before his eyes, in the life of the nation. The punishment he announces, as well as the humiliation, penitence and deliverance to come, are those of the people and its rulers, among whom the prophet uttered his words of rebuke and warning. We never find him, in these undoubted chapters, casting his eye forward into a far-distant future; speaking of judgments or deliverances which would have only a secondary interest for the people of his own day. In these chapters, which are all marked by similar qualities of style, and by a like vigour and eloquence of conception and expression, Isaiah never loses sight of his own actual present. He does not, in any instance, go forward to the time of Christ, for example, nor even to the time of the Babylonian captivity. If it be said that he does this in the eleventh chapter, and that the prophecy of the rod from the stem of Jesse and the branch from his roots plainly refers to the future coming of Christ—the reply is obvious. This chapter is so connected with what precedes, that it cannot be separated from it.

The figure of the forest (end of ch. x.) is, in a manner, continued in the contrasted conception of the shoot that is to grow up from the stem of Jesse. The one, representing the Assyrian invaders, then present or close at hand, is to be cut down and destroyed: AND (xi. 1) the young branch is to spring up into vigorous growth,—a prince, that is, under the protection of Jehovah, enabled by that protection to prevail over the then existing enemies of the nation. The latter part of the chapter shews how entirely different from the kingdom of Christ is that which is to be ruled over by this favoured prince. If, in short, we have in this place Isaiah's anticipation of the Messiah, it is equally evident that the Messiah he was anticipating was to be a great prince and a conqueror of nations, one soon to come and not separated by seven centuries from the prophet's own day. In other words, it was evidently not him who said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Similar remarks apply equally to the first half of the ninth chapter.

The *second* point to be especially noticed in these unquestioned chapters, is the principle which appears to have determined the order in which they stand. Their arrangement is manifestly not chronological. The first chapter is, without doubt, later than the seventh; that is, it refers to a state of things later than that to which the seventh belongs. In the first chapter most probably we see the judgment announced in the seventh actually fallen upon the land:

"Your country is desolate,
Your cities are burned with fire;
Your land, strangers devour it in your presence,
And it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers" (i. 7).

In the same manner the sixth chapter, had the arrangement been chronological, must have stood at the head of the collection, as belonging to the period when Isaiah began to prophesy. If, then, we cannot suppose the principle of the arrangement to have been a chronological one, can we discover what it is? It appears to have been simply what we may term a principle of moral fitness. The prophecies are put, loosely of course, in the order in which moral and religious exhortation naturally proceeds;—earnest remonstrance and denunciation of wrong-doing, threats of punishment, comfort and the hope of recovery, in the midst of suffering,

and penitence manifested ; the promise of deliverance at a later period, with the song of thanksgiving in gratitude for deliverance, at the close of all. We mention this point thus particularly, because the same principle of arrangement appears to pervade not only the first twelve chapters, but the whole book of Isaiah. The Jewish nation is, of course, the great subject of the prophet's observation. His chief reproofs, exhortations, announcements of punishment or deliverance, belong to his own people. But they stand in necessary connection with the political circumstances of their times, and with surrounding nations. The latter are often the medium of their chastisement ; are often, too, themselves wicked and idolatrous, and deserving of punishment for the very cruelties which they inflict upon the Hebrews. Hence, with the main strains which refer and belong to his own people, Isaiah so constantly intermingles the anticipation of the downfall of their enemies. It is, indeed, out of that downfall that the deliverance and exaltation of Israel are one day to spring. Hence, again, the alternating strains of vehement rebuke, or of joyful anticipation, or triumphant thanksgiving, in reference either to the Hebrews, or their invaders, as the case may be ; while, all the time, the trust of the prophet remains firm and clear. The result, he is assured, can only be that transgression, punishment, invasion, captivity, shall issue in penitence, pardon, deliverance and ultimate prosperity. Nor is it unworthy of observation that the same high spirit of religious trust is reflected, as we may say, by those who put together the prophecies of Isaiah, in their present order of arrangement—being manifested, in fact, by the circumstance that they are arranged as they are,—hope, deliverance, a prosperous future, triumph over the wicked and the oppressor, forming the burden of the last twenty-seven chapters of the book, and thus appropriately bringing up the rear of the grand procession led by the earlier prophecies.

The literary style of the twelve chapters which we are more particularly noticing, though very marked, is yet difficult to be described in few words. It is full of a rough energy and vehemence. It has little of rhetorical flow and smoothness ; rarely any softness or sweetness of expression, such as may be found in some other parts of the book of Isaiah. The sentences are often short and condensed, so as to make the

meaning obscure, not unlike what is frequently met with in Job; while yet we sometimes have passages that are smooth, well connected, and easy to read, such, for example, as occur in the last seven verses of ch. v., and also in parts of x., xi. But with these compare the latter part of ch. i., and the woes denounced in ch. v. The energy of both of these passages is remarkable; and, indeed, almost everywhere strength and vivacity are the qualities prominently exemplified by the prophecies now spoken of, and by all the undoubted writings of Isaiah. We may also note, as characteristic of the prophet, a wonderful abundance and variety of images and illustrations. It is true, actions, persons and objects, are often spoken of under their own proper designation; but, at other times, also, through the medium of figurative expressions. These are familiar to all readers of the Old Testament, but are so manifold and varied that they can scarcely be enumerated, or even classed together within any moderate space. What a succession both of images and illustrations, and of pithy descriptive phrases, we have, for example, in the first chapter! "The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib, but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider;" "A people laden with iniquity;" "The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint;" "Wounds and bruises and putrefying sores; they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither softened with ointment;" "The daughter of Zion left as a booth in a vineyard, as a hut in a cucumber-field;" "An oak whose leaf fadeth, and a garden that hath no water;"—each chapter has its store of these vivid, highly suggestive, more or less figurative expressions; the whole leaving upon the reader the impression that in the prophet Isaiah we have to do with a man of clear and commanding intellect, and at the same time of active and fertile imagination, as well as of the highest moral character, according to the standard of his times, joined to strong religious feeling and the most unflinching trust in the protecting power and goodness of Jehovah.

Indeed, it is hardly necessary to observe that the animating spirit of all that Isaiah has written is deeply religious. It is everywhere a profound conviction in the prophet's mind of the Divine presence and power in the world; the all-controlling thought of Jehovah as the sovereign Lord

of the universe, the Ruler and Protector, most especially, of His people Israel. The Assyrians and other enemies are but His instruments; the miseries of famine, slaughter, captivity, which they inflict, are His punishments, sent to humble and reform the sinful people, whom, with all their obstinacy and apostasy, He still loves and wishes to save. And a devout trust in the goodness and might of Jehovah, together with faithful obedience to the moral law as well pleasing in His sight, is what the prophet constantly seeks to enjoin and promote among his countrymen. Hence the comparative worthlessness of all ceremonies and sacrifices; the impossibility of the worship of idol deities; and the impolicy and uselessness of seeking protection from foreign powers, like Egypt and Assyria. This tranquil faith in God, accompanied by righteousness and purity of life, especially by justice and mercy on the part of the rich and powerful towards the poor and the weak, of rulers and judges towards the subject people, is the essential condition of the Divine protection; and, without these primary moral qualities, no assistance from foreign nations will be able to save the nation from punishment and its miseries. Amidst the worst times the prophet's high trust in Jehovah never fails him. Whatever the distress that might overtake the nation—as in the days of Ahaz (ch. viii. ix.), or in those of Hezekiah (x. xi.)—he still clings firmly to his confidence that happier times are in store for at least the remnant of his people. In this unshaken anticipation of deliverance from present evils, we have unquestionably the germ and substance of the great Messianic hope, whether as held by Isaiah and other prophets, or by the nation at large under the influence of their assurances and example. We nowhere, indeed, find the actual Christ of the Gospels distinctly spoken of by him or by any other prophet; nor is it at all probable that he, or any of his contemporaries or immediate successors looked forward to Messianic glories either so far removed from their own times, or of such a kind as those which belonged to the Prince of Peace. But, nevertheless, Isaiah's hopeful and trustful spirit doubtless went far towards creating and supporting the expectations of his people, and probably did much to give to those expectations the definite personal form of later times.

Passing on, in the next place, from what was probably

the first collection of Isaiah's writings—one possibly formed by the prophet himself—we come in the thirteenth chapter to a prophecy to which a new inscription is prefixed, indicating that we have here a new division of the book. This prophecy, as the inscription informs us, relates to Babylon. The chapter is closely connected with the one which follows, as far as v. 23; and no doubt the two chapters should be taken together as one whole, relating to one and the same subject, and also from one and the same pen.

The first verse of xiii. informs us that the prophecy is by Isaiah the son of Amoz. But for this statement no authority can be claimed. We know that, in many cases in the Psalms, the inscription is contradicted by the contents of the Psalm. So, therefore, it may be in this case. But how, it may be asked, does this appear? Why should not Isaiah have uttered this prophecy of the destruction of Babylon by the Medes, and the downfall of the Babylonian king? We are not disposed to urge the argument that such an exact foresight of the distant future is never experienced, and is in fact impossible; but there are other grounds for the conclusion, of a less speculative character. Some of these are as follows. The style of the two chapters is evidently different, even in the English version, from that of the twelve chapters of which we have just been speaking. It is smoother, more regular, more rhetorical. Words and phrases can be pointed out which belong to a later age than that of Isaiah, and can only be paralleled in the writings of Jeremiah and still later prophets. The two chapters speak of a mighty Babylonian power, which yet, as we know from history, had not in Isaiah's time come into existence; they speak of it as something already there, and well known to the people of the time, mentioning in the same style the Medes who are to overthrow it. "Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency;" the "king of Babylon" that "made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms;"—are introduced without a word of explanation as to who or what they are, or when they are to be—in a manner which could not have been possible to one writing for the information of men who lived nearly two hundred years before the events spoken of,—men who could never have heard either of a world-wide Babylonian empire, or of a mighty and all-subduing king of the same

name, who dared to say in his heart, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God" (xiv. 13). In Isaiah's time, it was the Assyrians who were all-important to the Hebrews, and Nineveh, not Babylon, was their capital city. It is with the former, therefore, that Isaiah has always to do, in his undoubted prophecies, and in all probability, when he wrote, neither Babylonians nor Medes had as yet been heard of in Judea as conquering powers. But, moreover, the commencement of the fourteenth chapter speaks of the Israelites as already, in the time of the writer, lying in captivity. Their deliverance is to come, but their downfall is past:

"And they shall hold them captive, whose captives they were,
And rule over their oppressors."

Then, again, there is much similarity of expression between some parts of these two chapters and what we find in ch. xxxiv. xxxv. The concluding verses of xiii. are quite parallel to xxxiv. 10—15; and thus we are brought to the inference that the two earlier chapters must either be ascribed to the author of the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth, or else attributed to some other unknown writer who lived subsequently to the time of Isaiah;—long enough subsequently, in a word, to have the actual experience of the tyranny of the Babylonian conquerors, and of the sufferings of the captivity which his expressions indicate.

The division of the book of Isaiah which begins with ch. xiii. will be seen to extend to the close of xxiii., and to be distinguished by marked features of its own. First, all these chapters—or rather, we should say, all the main sub-sections of this part, comprising, in some instances, two chapters each—have inscriptions: (1), ch. xiii. xiv. are entitled "The burden of Babylon;" (2), ch. xv. xvi., "The burden of Moab;" (3), ch. xvii., "The burden of Damascus;" and so in other cases. But it is to be observed that a few minor sections are interspersed among the longer prophecies; and, though relating to entirely different subjects and periods of time, appear in the present arrangement as if a part of the longer passages to which they are attached. This must needs give rise to some confusion to the reader of the English Bible, divided, as it is, merely into chapters. For example, to the prophecy about the destruction of Babylon, in ch. xiv.,

are added some verses announcing the overthrow of the Assyrians (v. 24—27); and then, again, a short prophecy against the Philistines, belonging most probably to the period when the advance of the Assyrians, coming to the deliverance of king Ahaz, would naturally repress the pride and daring of the ancient enemy of Judah,—“Palestina,” as this enemy is named in our common version, *Philistia*, as it ought to be rendered (xiv. 29). So, again, to ch. xvii., concerning Damascus, there is appended a section (xvii. 12—xviii. 7) referring manifestly to the sudden destruction of a great invading host, probably that of the Assyrian army under Sennacherib.

It follows, of course, that the chapters with the minor sections thus appended to them, forming this second part of Isaiah, are not in their proper chronological order. Most probably this was not thought of by the collector; or he did not consider it a point of sufficient importance to be more exactly ascertained. He contented himself with prefixing to each portion an inscription indicating its subject. In some cases this is correctly done; in one or two others incorrectly. It is observable, moreover, that all the contents of this division relate to foreign nations, with perhaps one exception. We have Babylon, Philistia, Moab, Damascus, Egypt, Babylon again (xxi.), Idumæa, Arabia, Tyre. The exception is ch. xxii.,—if, indeed, the earlier part of this chapter, to v. 14, be an exception. It refers to the consternation occasioned in Jerusalem by the approach of an invading army, probably the Assyrians under Sennacherib. The latter part of the same chapter relates to the downfall of Shebna, a sort of prime minister of king Hezekiah. He had probably been a leader of the party (always denounced by Isaiah) who relied upon Egypt for help, and who would necessarily flee at the approach of the invading Assyrians, the rivals of Egypt. Excepting, then, ch. xxii., the whole or part of it, all the prophecies of this division relate to foreign nations, or to a condition of home politics immediately arising out of foreign relationships. But while, again, the larger part of these chapters relate to the time of Isaiah and have the characteristics of his style, this is not the case with the whole of them. The case of ch. xiii. xiv. we have already considered. Ch. xv. xvi. will be found in a somewhat altered form in the forty-eighth of Jeremiah. But is

it probable that Jeremiah borrowed the passage from Isaiah, and altered so considerably the words of a great prophet who lived less than a century before himself? It is decidedly a preferable supposition that both Isaiah and Jeremiah adopted the whole passage from some prophet older than either—whether this may have been the Jonah of 2 Kings xiv. 25, or some other prophet. Various forms of expression, and many words in the two chapters, are found to be without parallel in the undoubted writings of Isaiah; and besides this, the latter prophet himself virtually informs us (xvi. 13, 14) that in the two chapters he has only repeated an ancient prophecy concerning Moab: "This is the word which Jehovah has spoken of old concerning Moab;" adding the statement that, within three years, it shall be fulfilled.

Besides the foregoing passage, there is another short section which can scarcely be from the pen of Isaiah. This is xxi. 1—10, and relates to Babylon. What we have previously said, in the case of the larger section on the same subject, is equally applicable here. Babylonians and Medes were both unheard of in Judea as great powers in Isaiah's time, so far as we know. They could not, therefore, have been introduced in this way without some kind of explanation—after the manner of xxiii. 13. Nor can we understand in what way such a prophecy as that of xxi. 1—10, could tend to give any comfort, hope or courage, to the men of Isaiah's own day, in mortal terror as they were of a mighty Assyrian enemy close at hand. It would seem like a mockery of their distress to announce to them that a hundred and fifty years hence, or more, Babylon would be overthrown, a great Babylonian empire destroyed which did not yet exist. What was wanted was deliverance from the Assyrians now, present confidence and firmness, in the midst of present anxiety and suffering. These might indeed be imparted by the prophecies which speak so distinctly at times of the destruction of the enemy then at hand, and the rise of the Jewish power as the result; while strains of triumph over the humiliation of distant and unheard-of Babylon, with the deliverance of a future generation of Hebrews from a future generation of heathen oppressors, would have been as little to the purpose as to tell a man ready to perish with hunger that some one would hereafter take pity on his great-grand-

children and see that they are delivered from starvation ; as little to the purpose as to tell him this, and call upon him at the same time to raise a song of exultation at the prospect !

It results from what we have said that all the unquestionable writings of Isaiah, so far as we have as yet noticed them, are distinguishable by various common qualities. First of all, there are peculiarities of literary style and in the use of words, which connect them together and separate them from other portions of the book. Then, secondly, there are peculiarities of conception, figures and illustrations, which are more within the appreciation of the English reader, some of which we have briefly touched upon. And, thirdly, there is this indisputable fact, that the prophet's immediate sympathies and whole activity were engaged with the affairs of his own day. The desolation of his land by invading Syrians, Israelites or Assyrians ; the impiety and practical wickedness of the ruling men of his nation ; the pride and prodigality of "the daughters of Zion ;" the unbelief of king Abaz ; the anticipated downfall of an unworthy prime minister ; the near approach of the Assyrian army to Jerusalem, followed by its destruction and the renewed power of his own nation under a wise and prosperous king ;—matters of present, immediate concern such as these, are what fill Isaiah's undoubted prophecies. Finding this to be the case, we naturally pause and hesitate, when we come upon passages which have no relation to such present interests of his time, but refer to persons or events to arise long years, or centuries, after him ; which seem, moreover, by their very form of thought and expression, to have been written not in anticipation, but in the midst, of the circumstances to which the words relate.

If, however, it be said that all these prophecies were ascribed to Isaiah in ancient times by those who must surely have known that they were his, and who arranged them together accordingly in one book—to this the answer is evident. We cannot suppose the collectors of Isaiah's prophecies to have been infallible. They may have erred in regard to the authorship of sections of the book, which must originally have existed in detached pieces. We know that the collectors of Psalms have made similar mistakes,—in ascribing compositions to David, for example, which

cannot have come down from his time. Why should not a collector of prophecies have done the same? Detached prophecies, the authorship of which was not certainly known, would be likely to be attributed to Isaiah, the greatest prophet of his nation ;—just as we know it to have been with the “sweet Psalmist of Israel” in the case of many of the Psalms. Hence, again, the diversity in the contents of the book of Isaiah ; the great bulk of the earlier half of which, nevertheless, is unquestionably from his hand, while yet including also some portions which, from style and subject matter, can only be ascribed to authors who lived long after him.

In the twenty-fourth and three following chapters we have a cycle of prophecies somewhat similar to that formed by the first twelve chapters of the book. A desolated land, the punishment of the transgressions of its inhabitants ; the escape of some (xxiv. 14, 15) ; anticipated reformation ; deliverance and the song of triumph ;—such is the theme of these four chapters, which have an evident connection with each other, and must be taken as one whole, separate from what precedes and follows them. There is nothing very decided in the section to determine the time of the calamities to which it refers, or even to fix very certainly the land or people upon which the troubles are to fall. But yet it can only be Judah, Jerusalem, and the Jewish nation that are to be afflicted and raised again out of their affliction, while a persecuting enemy, “even leviathan the flying serpent,” is to be punished and slain. The prophet would scarcely have spoken in such detail of any people but his own (xxiv. 2) ; and it is clear from the beginning of xxvi. and the close of xxvii., that Judah, and Jerusalem, and the “children of Israel,” are within the writer’s view. The style of the passage, we should suppose, will strike the intelligent English reader as somewhat different from that of the undoubted compositions of Isaiah. It is, indeed, difficult to describe such differences, because of the various appreciation of readers ; and, perhaps, we ought only to say that there appears to us in this case to be much peculiarity of conception and expression, while various prominent words can undoubtedly be pointed out in the Hebrew which are not used by Isaiah. On the whole, the evidence seems decidedly to preponderate in favour of the conclusion that

the section is from a writer who lived long after the great prophet, and that the devastation of the land is that which took place at the time of Nebuchadnezzar's invasion. The prophecy itself (xxiv. 1 seq.) professes to be written in the midst of the desolation, of which it speaks as of something that has taken place. What it indicates as future is the restoration and ultimate rejoicing of the nation; anticipations in which we have, as before noticed, the germ of the Messianic expectations of later days, if we have not indeed, in this instance, as some have thought, a looking forward to the actual times of a Hebrew Messiah.

The remaining chapters of the earlier half of Isaiah, from the twenty-eighth to the thirty-third, both inclusive, all relate to the times of Isaiah. They exhibit also, in general terms, the usual characteristics of the prophet's style, with the exception of a few verses here and there, which are somewhat more elaborate and flowing, and less abrupt and vehement, than are many of his utterances. The latter half of xxix., and also of xxx., seem to justify this remark, while yet there is no sufficient reason for doubting the authorship of these passages; and in fact the authenticity of the entire section, including xxxiii., which belongs probably to the time of Sennacherib's invasion, is not usually questioned, unless it be that Ewald thinks the last-named chapter to have been written rather by a disciple of Isaiah than by the prophet himself—a supposition which we may allow to pass for what it is worth.

From the foregoing remarks it is clearly apparent how great a mistake it is, in the exposition of Isaiah's writings, to take for granted, as so many still do, including learned clergymen and bishops, that the prophet was mainly, or even largely, occupied with predictions relating to a distant future. The immediate future, we may well understand, was within the vision of the earnest seer; and the consequences of actions, righteous or unrighteous, could not be hidden from him. The results of political measures also, such as the application for Assyrian assistance, in bringing the little nation of the Jews into subjection to the greatest empire then existing; or the going down to Egypt for help, as likely to make Palestine the battle-field of mighty rival powers, arraying Assyria and Egypt against each other; such results as these were clearly within the reach of the

sagacious political observer, and were likely to be dwelt upon, as they are in fact, by a man who held the position, and discharged the functions, and felt the overmastering inspiration, of a prophet of Jehovah. It is not possible to read a chapter, scarcely a verse, of the unquestioned writings of Isaiah without feeling that their interpretation is thus most closely bound up with contemporary events. Just as in Joel, for example, we have the famine caused by the locusts, and in Nahum the fall of Nineveh, and in Hosea the religious apostasies of Israel,—so, in Isaiah, we have the denunciation of divine judgments upon a wicked and idolatrous nation, the inroad of the Syrians and Israelites under Pekah and Rezin, the march of the Assyrian army to Jerusalem, with other matters of the same obviously immediate and national interest. Nor is it going too far to say that such subjects fill up the whole horizon of the prophet's vision.

Yet it is wonderful to see how, in spite of such facts, the modern expounder, bound in the chains of long-descended traditions, will persist in finding predictions of distant and remote persons and events, even in such matters of local and immediate concern. How adroitly this may be done, with what singular self-deception—for we do not for one moment question the good faith of these popular expositors—may be seen by a reference to one of the latest writers on Isaiah, the author* of the article on this prophet, in the Dictionary of the Bible, edited by Dr. William Smith. The following passages will shew, in few words, the general tenor of this article, in connection with the subject now spoken of:

“As the time approaches [for the overthrow of the Assyrians] the spirit of prophecy becomes more and more glowing; that marvellous deliverance from Ashur, wherein God's name (xxx. 27) so gloriously came near, opens even clearer glimpses into the time when God should indeed come and reign in the Anointed One, and when virtue and righteousness should everywhere prevail (xxxii. 1—8, 15—20); then the mighty Jehovah should be a king dwelling amongst his people (xxxiii. 17, 22): He should Himself be a sea of glory and defence encircling them, in which all hostile galleys should perish.”†

* Described in the list of contributors as “Edgar Huxtable, M. A., Sub-dean of Wells, Vice-principal of Theological College, Wells.”

† Dict. of Bible, I. p. 884.

Again :

"As xxxiv. has a general sense, so xxxv. indicates, in general terms, the deliverance of Israel as if out of captivity, rejoicing in their secure and happy march through the wilderness. *It may be doubted whether the description is meant to apply to any deliverance out of temporal captivity,*"* closely as the imagery approaches that of the second part. It seems rather to picture the march of the spiritual Israel to her eternal Zion (Heb. xii. 22)."+

Again, we are told—

"It is characteristic of sacred prophecy, in general, that the 'vision' of a great deliverer leads the seer to glance at the great deliverance to come through Jesus Christ. This association of ideas is found in several passages in the first part of Isaiah, in which the destruction of the Assyrian army suggests the thought of Christ (a.g., x. 24—xi. 16, xxxi. 8—xxxii. 2)."+

In reference to vii. 3—16, where we have the announcement of the birth of the child Immanuel, the Sub-dean of Wells writes thus :

"That the Messiah is here pointed to cannot be doubted; indeed, even Ewald sees this. But the exact interpretation of vv. 15, 16, is hard to determine. . . . The great difficulty attaching to it is that the prophet represents Christ as already appearing, reckoning from his birth, at the then present time, forward to the desolation of Syria and Israel within a few years. This difficulty is, however, alleviated by the consideration that the prophet states the future as exhibited to him in 'vision;' and in such prophetic vision the distances between events in point of time are often unperceived by the seer, who perhaps might sometimes, in his own private interpretation of the vision (comp. 1 Pet. i. 10), have misconceived the relation of time in regard to events. The very clearness with which the future event was exhibited to him might deceive him in judging of its nearness."§

Truly, a curious way of alleviating the difficulty! The prophet, we are to understand, has a vision of so great and glorious a future as the advent of Christ; but "in his own private interpretation" of it, he makes a mistake of six or seven centuries in regard to the time of its fulfilment, and thinks that the far-distant event is to come to pass within a year or two! The clearness with which he saw the object

* We put this astounding statement in italics.

+ Dict. of Bible, I. p. 884.

‡ Ibid., p. 886.

§ Ibid., p. 886, note.

only deceived him as to its distance ; the divine inspiration, which enabled him to see it and to speak of it, did not preserve him from applying it to the wrong time and the wrong persons ! He spoke, as the result of his illumination, only of the deliverance of the land from invading enemies in the time of Ahaz, by the coming of the Assyrians, when he might have spoken, or ought to have spoken, of the deliverance of the world seven hundred years afterwards from the bondage of Satan, by the coming of Christ ! As if, indeed, the *time* were the only difficulty involved in this interpretation ; as if all would be plain and clear, provided only Isaiah had understood that the promised child would be born in the reign of Augustus instead of the reign of Ahaz ; as if the whole passage would not be one insuperable difficulty to the eye of reasonable criticism, on the supposition that it relates to any other persons or events except and beyond those of the time then actually present, and within the view of the prophet and his contemporaries !

A person who can write thus will of course have no difficulty in detecting or in interpreting predictions, or prophetic allusions, or what Dr. Pusey terms "direct Messianisms," wherever he may see fit to look for them in the pages of Scripture. The wonder is that these writers stop where they do—that such characters and objects as Ahaz, Hezekiah, the Assyrian army, Sennacherib, Egypt, Tyre, and a multitude of similar names, are not, in the manner of Origen and others of the ancients, taken in some mystical sense, and found to denote Christ, and either the Church or its enemies of later times.

Such modes of interpretation, we must say, appear to us to be childish and trivial in the extreme. We cannot understand how they can come from men who would evidently regard the Bible with the respect due to a sacred book—a book, indeed, which they say they receive as the very word of God. We are doubly perplexed when we remember that some of these writers are men of scholarship too, who can read Hebrew and quote from German books. The explanation is doubtless to be found in the perverting influence upon the judgment of the prevailing Evangelicalism, to say nothing of the almost equally prevailing Anglicanism—the one telling its disciples, in effect, that it is but profane and sinful "rationalism" to apply the reason in searching the

Scriptures; the other, that there can be no knowledge of religious truth, and no right interpretation of the Bible, except in harmony with the Creeds and Articles of the Church of England.

We need scarcely observe that we are not writing an exposition of the book of Isaiah, and do not therefore deem it necessary to dwell more minutely than we have done on either the occasion or the meaning of its various contents. Our object has been simply to point out reasons, which lie within reach of a reader of the English Bible, for distinguishing between certain portions of the book and certain other portions—reasons for concluding that some are from the prophet's pen, while others are not. In a future paper we hope to complete our task by some discussion of the question of the authenticity of the remaining chapters, and of the peculiarities of style and language which distinguish them from the portion so rapidly passed over in the present article.

GEORGE VANCE SMITH.

II.—ROBERTSON'S LIFE AND LETTERS.

The Life and Letters of the Rev. Frederick W. Robertson, M.A., Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. Edited by Stopford A. Brooke, M.A., late Chaplain to the Embassy at Berlin. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Smith and Elder. 1865.

THERE exist at all times in the world's history, but rather pre-eminently in our own age, minds of an order with which it is somewhat difficult to deal justly. They are those which seem to be without logical cohesion, whose ideas and opinions (often full of genius and of wisdom) seem disparate one from another, and out of whose recorded words it is impossible to construct a consistent or even intelligible system. Like so many orchids, their luxuriant flowers attract our eyes, while their sweetness touches our hearts; but when we try to find the root of faith from which such beauty has sprung,—lo! some old decaying tree, to which the delicate stem lightly adheres, is all we can discover. We

always seem in the wrong as regards them. They attract us, delight us—truly aid our spiritual life by their insight and their tender piety. Then we think to make them our guides; but the magi of old might as well have followed a fire-fly! Again, we are provoked, indignant. We condemn them, and even in our impatience question their honesty: Why does not the man who says this and this, say also this and this? Why does he who avows ideas such as the founders of his Church never dreamed of, or condemned bitterly if they did, stop within their fold, and profess to find green pastures where there are but swine's husks of dead symbols? Hardly have we uttered the question, but we are rebuked. "Men so good, so meek of heart, so pure of life, so full of high and holy thoughts—what are we that we should summon them before our tribunal, or judge them by the laws of our individual conscience of sincerity? Let us return and hearken to their prophesyings." The books of these men are like those districts of Wales and Ireland,

"Where sparkles of golden splendour
All over the surface shine."

Every page has its glittering thought, its grain of pure, true gold. But the "Lagenian mine" can somehow never be worked to profit. The ore is too mixed and scattered. We explore it, and of our spoils make for us a ring of remembrance, a locket, perhaps a delicate chain of linked thoughts. But we cannot mint it into coin to pass from hand to hand, enriching ourselves and the world.

These reflections have occurred to us while reading the Sermons of one of the greatest and purest of these cloudy prophets, the lamented Frederick Robertson. They are not those which his Biography (which it is now our task to review) most prominently suggests. No man of ordinary sympathies could read this book and think first of dissecting the opinions of its subject, and testing whether, as in a child's toy, one piece fitted accurately into another. Few, on the contrary, will read it, we are persuaded, without being moved to a sad and tender sympathy, that sympathy with the soul of our brother wherein his intellectual gifts and failures alike become well-nigh indifferent. Robertson's name has for some years been one of power in the religious life of England. Dating from the publication of this Life

and these Letters, we believe it will become henceforth a typical one, like those of Arnold and Blanco White. The personal impression which he made on those who knew him in life, and which always seems to have exceeded (in the proportion common to highly emotional characters) the impression received through his written words, will now be shared by thousands. We envy not those who can receive it without being thereby touched to the heart as by the self-disclosure of a friend who should be worthy of all our admiration, and at the same time claim from us such compassion as may yet be given to one who walked with God on earth, and is surely gone home to Him now.

The tangible facts of the Life of Robertson may be summed up in a few brief sentences. Never had a biographer less practical material to work with, scarce even an anecdote worth narrating. If the result in this book be in a literary sense somewhat monotonous, it is redeemed by great simplicity on the part of the biographer, and much discriminating analysis of character, and perhaps we may add, by an almost excessive reticence as to family and social relations, which would have filled in the background of the picture and given it more familiar reality, at the expense perchance of delicacy more wisely respected. Few even of the letters have any names attached to them, and if they ever contained expressions of individual attachment, they have been expunged, leaving much of the true character of the letters unexplained. We cannot but think the judgment which dictated this last measure in any case, a mistake. Letters are not *the same things* addressed to persons of different ages, sexes and characters—persons with whom the writer holds totally different relationships. Many expressions of weariness, annoyance, personal feelings of all kinds, such as these letters contain, are precisely natural or morbid, legitimate or unmanly and egotistical, in view of the individual addressed, and his or her relationship to the writer. In matters like these, of course we are bound to give credit to the biographer for having exercised the best judgment possible under circumstances unknown to us. We can but regret the fact, and do so the more unhesitatingly, since, whatever inimical and slanderous tongues may have said, these letters, to whomsoever addressed, bear with them the refutation of all calumny, save such as first goads its victim to irrita-

tion, and then points to the irritation with sanctimonious condemnation. There has been but one Colenso in England to balk such tormentors of their feast !

Again, Robertson's friendships are not only left anonymous, but his closest ties and relationships are mentioned in the briefest way. His marriage is detailed in one sentence, and, after the beginning of the work, where one beautiful letter to his brother is inserted, and a few others to his parents, there is hardly half a page of the two bulky volumes devoted to either his early or later home circle. What Rénan has striven to do for us in the case of Robertson's great Master, namely, to give us a clear mental picture of the *milieu* in which his life and thoughts revolved, is precisely what Robertson's biographer seems to have carefully avoided, till in his care to protect the susceptibilities or respect the privacy of the living, he has left us rather the startling apparition of "a priest after the order of Melchisedek," than the portrait of an English clergyman who within all our memories was the popular preacher of a familiar Brighton chapel. We can resume the bare facts of his career, such as Mr. Brooke gives them, in a single page.

Frederick William Robertson was the son and grandson of soldiers, and from his boyhood was passionately attached to, and desirous of entering the military profession. After a year's futile attempt to make him a solicitor, his father endeavoured to obtain for him a commission in the army. A long delay occurred before the request was granted ; and during the interval, the influence of friends and his father's wishes induced Frederick Robertson to enter Oxford and prepare for the Church. In 1840 he was ordained, and acted as curate first at Winchester, subsequently at Cheltenham and Oxford. Brief journeys to Germany and the Tyrol formed his holiday recreation. On one of these occasions, as his biographer succinctly states, "he met (at Geneva), and after a short acquaintance married, Helen, third daughter of Sir G. W. Denys, Bart., of Easton Neston, Northamptonshire. Almost immediately after his marriage he returned to Cheltenham." The "only external events which marked the five years of his life" during which he was curate to the Rev. Archibald Boyd, were "the birth of three children and the death of one." In 1847 he accepted the incumbency of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, and there he

laboured, becoming each year more beloved and honoured, but each year more feeble in health and weary of spirit, till in 1853 his condition became alarming, and his congregation subscribed to supply him with a curate, by whose aid his work might be lightened. Robertson chose his friend Mr. Tower for the office. The appointment was subject to the approval of Mr. Wagner, vicar of Brighton, who had previously been engaged in controversy with Mr. Tower on financial matters connected with a charitable institution. Mr. Wagner refused to ratify the nomination of Mr. Tower, and Robertson refused to appoint another curate. During the angry contention which thereupon occupied the entire population of Brighton, the last chances of recovery for Robertson's health were irretrievably lost. A disease whose seat seemed to be at the base of the brain, and which caused him intense suffering, terminated his life on the 15th of August, 1853, in his thirty-seventh year. His last words were—"I cannot bear it. Let me rest. I must die. Let God do His work."

Such is the outline of a life which was filled in by a thousand touches of piety, genius and goodness. The study of it is indeed purely the study of the man Robertson, not of the career of a more or less successful preacher or student or reformer. Of the world at large, nothing is to be learned from his Biography, save the old lesson, that a good man must needs find friends, and a gifted one, admirers, and an honest and bold one, enemies. The observations on books and on social and religious problems contained in the letters are interesting, but rather as affording glimpses into the feelings of the writer, than as illuminating the subjects themselves in the way a great mind generally effects by each passing gleam of notice. Of politics, we only hear that Robertson was in sentiment aristocratic, and by force of his allegiance to the great Reformer of Galilee, who spake the parable of Dives, a democrat and an inveigher against the luxuries of the rich. Of those works of philanthropy which men of his energy usually choose whereon to centre their labours, we hear little. Neither the relief of poverty, nor the reform of crime, nor the repression of vice, no enthusiastic alliance with abolition or temperance movements, is to be traced as a thread connecting his efforts at any period of his life. One only work did he seem to undertake

with peculiar zest. The Association of the Working Men of Brighton found in him their warmest friend. His Addresses to them contain some of his very finest thoughts, and he appears to have had their cause nearer to his heart than any other. If this be so, we may perhaps adjudge to Robertson the exalted praise of having been one of the very first to turn philanthropy into a new and noble channel wherein it has since run freely. Beyond his lectures and assistance to the working men, it would seem, however, as if his great tenderness of heart poured itself rather generally than with any special purpose or object. In a word, the power of Robertson was almost unnaturally devoid of external or tangible manifestation. Even the religious doctrines he taught have singularly little definiteness of shape or substance, so that we might account him the prophet of this or that truth or precept. We insensibly describe him rather by negatives than affirmatives, and say he did not do or teach what others have done or taught, rather than that he accomplished such a work or gave to the world such a doctrine. We close his Life with the sense (oftener left on us by women than by men) that we have been impressed beyond the calculable power of the impressing spirit, and attracted rather magnetically than by any gravitation of mere mass of mind. He was the living evidence of the truth that Character is greater than Action, and to *be* good more effectual to benefit mankind than the *doing* of any work whatsoever.

The first and most obvious interest to the reader of the life of Robertson is the history of his religious opinions. It may be told briefly, though less briefly than that of his worldly career.

Whatever be the evils and errors of that form of Christianity which claims the name of "Evangelical," it must be admitted to leave commonly on souls which have received its influences in childhood, what we may describe as a high-strung spiritual temperament. The early initiation into the most solemn mysteries of the inner life; the perpetual strain after a repentance disproportionately meted to childish offences; the awful terrors of eternal woe made familiar even before one human sorrow has dimmed the brightness of life's morning;—all these features of Evangelical education tend to the formation of a moral constitution delicate

to the verge of disease. Much that is best and holiest—much deep sense of the realities of the unseen world, much of that keener conscientiousness which never leaves a man content with merely outward performance of duty unless he also feels the dutiful sentiment, much self-distrust and self-depreciation judged by the standard of an almost superhuman purity and devotion—much of all this is the legacy of a youth spent under the influences of Evangelical Christianity. But, like a child who has been nurtured in heated rooms on too stimulating food, and whose brain has been overtaxed by his tutors, there is an inheritance of over-strung nerves, of feelings subject to morbid excitement and no less morbid exhaustion and deadness,—in a word, of a moral hypochondria, for which largest allowance must be made when we would estimate the later attainments of one subjected to such discipline. Robertson seems to have received these influences with all the susceptibility of his nature, and with the added circumstance of physical delicacy tending to disease of the brain. It would have seemed as if there never were a temperament of body or mind more needing the calming influence of a perfectly healthy creed, nor one which more vividly manifested the results, both for good and evil, of the faith in which he was trained, and of the different but yet far from joyful one in which he lived and died.

The early Evangelical impressions of Robertson, derived apparently from both parents, were full of childlike fervour. He seems to have been “good” as a school-boy, in the same degree as Channing, whose comrades said of him that it was no merit in him to be obedient and studious; he had no temptation to be otherwise. His childhood and youth appear to have been exemplary and faultless. If they were in any measure diversified by more natural traits, his biographer has erred in suppressing them, for we must confess that the impression left on us by these early pages and by certain over-wise school-boy letters is not altogether a pleasant one. Robertson, indeed, seems to have been a manly boy, steady, brave, active, fond of field sports and enthusiastic about military glory; a “muscular Christian” even in his Evangelical days. His ambition, therefore, curiously compounded of the different elements of his character, took the form of desiring to set “the example of a pure and

Christian life in his corps, and becoming the Cornelius of his regiment. . . . To two great objects he devoted himself wholly, the profession of arms and the service of Christ." When he was persuaded to give up the military career and adopt that of a clergyman, which he had often vehemently repudiated before, he seems to have done so under a singular sense of constraint and self-abnegation, and, as his biographer expresses it, to have accepted "somewhat sternly his destiny." He was, however, at that time, according to his friend Mr. Davies, in the full flush of youthful spirit and energy. "At the time to which I refer, I never knew him otherwise than cheerful, and there were times when his spirits were exuberant—times when he was in the mood of thoroughly enjoying everything. He was a constant and prayerful student of his Bible. At this time he held firmly what are understood as Evangelical views. He advocated strongly the pre-millennial advent of Christ."

Beginning his residence at Brasenose in October, 1837, it was impossible that Robertson should not have been drawn into the vortex of the great Tractarian movement then in progress. The result seems to have been a speedy recoil, and an effort to counteract the tendency among his friends by the establishment of a society for prayer and religious discussion. "No change took place in his doctrinal views, which were those of the Evangelical school, with a decided leaning to moderate Calvinism." After a college course of faultless moral excellence, he was ordained, in 1840, to a curacy in Winchester. "The prevailing tone of his mind on entering the ministry was one of sadness. His spirit consumed the body. He never was content, he never thought that he had attained, rather that he was lagging far behind, the Christian life. Everywhere this is reflected in his letters. His feeling of it was so strong, that it seemed rather to belong to a woman than to a man, and at certain times the resulting depression was so great that he fell into a morbid hopelessness." His work at Winchester, however, was largely successful, his rector proved a kind and congenial friend, and his mode of life seemed the ideal of devotion. "Study all the morning; in the afternoon hard fagging at visitation of the poor in the closest and dirtiest streets of Winchester; his evenings were spent sometimes alone, but very often with his rector." His habits, indeed,

here took an ascetic shape, such as by some occult law of nature it would appear every strong soul, at the outset of its higher life, spontaneously adopts. The Quarantania fast of Christ has had its unconscious copyists in every age and under every creed. Elijah and Gotama, Buddha and Zoroaster, earned through such means their prophet-mantles, and since their day thousands of lesser men have felt that "lusting of the spirit against the flesh," in which the spirit is ever cruel in its first victory. Robertson, we are told, created a system of restraint in food and sleep. For nearly a year he almost altogether refrained from meat. He compelled himself to rise early. "He refrained also much from society." In some private meditations and resolutions written at this time (1843—1845) there occur long strings of reasons to fortify the determination to eat with stringent self-denial and to rise early; and the "Resolves" are full of that still deeper asceticism which starts from holiest ambitions, and, alas! ends too often in most morbid self-anatomy and self-consciousness.

"To try to feel my own insignificance.

To speak less of self, and think less.

To feel it degradation to speak of my own doings as a poor braggart.

To perform rigorously the examen of conscience," &c.*

On all this portion of Robertson's life, the biographer makes wise and pertinent remarks; how it was the natural result of the school in which he had been trained, and how he escaped from it into a manlier spirit, not without bearing away some fruit of self-knowledge and of knowledge of other men. His sermons, in later years, at Brighton, were full of protests against these mistakes of his youth, when his very genius seemed under a cloud, and the force and originality he was soon to develop were kept under by the restraints of his creed.

The threat of hereditary consumption in 1841, compelled him to give up his work at Winchester and go abroad, oppressed by a sense of despondency and failure. A pedestrian tour, extending to Geneva, soon renewed his health and spirits. He plunged into controversy with every one who would discuss with him—Catholics, Rationalists,

* Pp. 99, 100.

Atheists—and “believed that there is at this time a determined attack made by Satan and his instruments to subvert that cardinal doctrine of our best hopes—justification by faith alone.” A Genevan minister denying the “Deity of Christ,” is told that he cannot be a Christian, and that his young monitor “trembles for him.” Altogether we have a picture of the earnest, narrow, devout Evangelical clergyman, familiar enough to all of us who have seen much of the world, but who, we have rarely had reason to suppose, could in this life assume the spiritual wings of a Robertson, and fly like him into free fields of air.

In the summer of 1842, Robertson became the curate of the Rev. Archibald Boyd, then of Cheltenham, a gentleman for whom he entertained the greatest respect, and who was certainly not likely to have guided him out of the very straitest sect of the orthodox. We can remember hearing Mr. Boyd about this period preaching at Cheltenham, and denouncing Unitarians with such singular vehemence, that it induced us to institute careful inquiries concerning a body of whose tenets we were at that time ignorant. Robertson was at first in full harmony with Mr. Boyd's opinions, but the hour for a great revolution in his soul's history was approaching.

Calvinism has had its Heroic Age—the age of the Pilgrim Fathers, of Brainerd and of Hopkins. It has an Age of Saints still, as many a bed of agonizing disease testifies in home and hospital in England to-day. But there is a phase of the religion not heroic nor yet saintly—a phase to check the ardour and alienate the allegiance of any man true of heart like Robertson. Probably in such a place as a fashionable church at Cheltenham, that unlovely phase may be met with in its most exaggerated development.

“At first (says his biographer) he believed that all who spoke of Christ were Christ-like. But he was rudely undeceived. His truthful character, his earnestness, at first unconsciously and afterwards consciously, recoiled from all the unreality around him. He was so pained by the expressions of religious emotion which fell from those who were living a merely fashionable life, that he states himself in one of his letters that he gave up reading all books of a devotional character, lest he should be lured into the same habit of feeling without acting. His conceptions also of Christianity as the religion of just and loving tolerance made

him draw back with horror from the violent and blind denunciations which the religious agitators and the religious papers of the extreme portion of the Evangelical party indulged in under the cloak of Christianity. 'They tell lies,' he said, 'in the name of God. Others tell them in the name of the Devil: that is the only difference.' It was this, and other things of the same kind, which first shook his faith in Evangelicalism."*

In 1843, he wrote to a friend: "As to the state of the Evangelical clergy I think it lamentable. I see sentiment, instead of principle, and a miserable mawkish religion superseding a state which once was healthy. I stand alone, a theological Ishmael." In the following year other doubts and difficulties arose. His preaching altered in tone, and he suddenly awoke to the conviction "that the system on which he had founded his whole faith and work could never be received by him again." An outward blow—the sudden ruin of a friendship—accelerated the inward crisis; and the result was a period of spiritual agony so awful that it smote his spirit down into so profound a darkness, that of all his early faiths but one remained, "It must be right to do right." He travelled away to Germany, and there, amid the beautiful hills and vales of the Tyrol, in long lonely walks and solitary musings, he passed through the great ordeal.

He fought his doubts and gathered strength,
He would not make his judgment blind,
He faced the spectres of the mind
And laid them: thus he came at length
To find a stronger faith his own;
And Power was with him in the night,
Which makes the darkness and the light,
And dwells not in the light alone.

Never has that dread battle been more faithfully fought—never has the victory been more nobly won. Long years afterwards, speaking to those working men with whom perhaps of all his hearers he had closest sympathies—men from whom most of our preachers would shut out the very name of religious doubt, or, if forced to treat of it, sternly dismiss them "to the law and to the testimony"—to these men Robertson disclosed what we cannot doubt

* Vol. I. p. 108.

was the history of his own spiritual struggle and the triumphant peace which followed it. We must be pardoned for copying the story at length. Few words, we believe, in any book, bear in them seeds of greater usefulness for our day of doubt and troubling of the waters. Like every true prophet, Robertson was the forerunner of his brethren, and passed before them through the dark river, telling them where ground might yet be found for their feet, even in its depths, till they should reach "the new firm land of faith beyond." For all the thousands who are now passing, and must presently pass, through those dread waters, and fear lest they go over, even over their souls, and whelm them in their deeps for ever, the history of Robertson's transition of faith is a most blessed lesson. By that way he went, and by that way only, we believe, in our day, shall the Nations of the Saved pass over.

"It is an awful moment when the soul begins to find that the props on which it blindly rested so long are, many of them, rotten, and begins to suspect them all; when it begins to feel the nothingness of many of the traditionary opinions which have been received with implicit confidence, and in that horrible insecurity begins also to doubt whether there be anything to believe at all. It is an awful hour, let him who has passed through it say how awful, when this life has lost its meaning, when the grave appears to be the end of all, human goodness nothing but a name, and the sky above this universe a dead expanse, black with the void from which God has disappeared. In that fearful loneliness of spirit, when those who should have been his friends and counsellors only frown upon his misgivings, and profanely bid him stifle doubts which, for aught he knows, may arise from the Fountain of truth itself, I know but one way in which a man may come forth from his agony scatheless; it is by holding fast to those things which are certain still,—the grand, simple landmarks of morality. In the darkest hour through which a human soul can pass, whatever else is doubtful, this at least is certain—*If there be no God and no future state, yet, even then, it is better to be generous than selfish, better to be chaste than licentious, better to be true than false, better to be brave than to be a coward.* Blessed, beyond all earthly blessedness, is the man who in the tempestuous darkness of the soul has dared to hold fast to these venerable landmarks. Thrice blessed is he who, when all is drear and cheerless within and without, when his teachers terrify him and his friends shrink from him, has obstinately clung

to moral good. Thrice blessed, because *his* night shall pass into clear bright day. I appeal to the recollection of any man who has passed through that hour of agony, and stood upon the rock at last, the surges stilled below him, and the last cloud drifted from the sky above, with a faith and hope and trust no longer traditional, but of his own—a faith which neither earth nor hell shall shake thenceforth for ever.”

Here is the “Saints’ Tragedy”—nay, the Saints’ triumphant Drama of Victory, the “Prometheus Unchained” of the inner life for us moderns, with our perishing theologies, our science and philosophy presenting to us a daily changing phantasmagoria of the material and mental universe. Our Apollyons are not the Apollyons of our fathers ; our Valley of the Shadow of Death is haunted by far direr spectres, and opens into far deeper and more fathomless abysses, than ever they beheld. But for us, too, there is a weapon to slay the dragon, a path through the realm of darkness and despair. Not any close-linked chain-mail of Evidences, any buckler of resolute Belief, shall defend us ; scarce may we even find strength to send to Heaven one winged arrow of Prayer. No guiding Star shall light our way through the pitfalls of the Valley. But, fighting blow for blow, winning step for step, against every fiend-like passion, every hell-born temptation, we shall gain at last the victory, pressing God’s lamp close to our breasts :

“Its radiance soon or late shall pierce the gloom ;
We shall emerge some day.”

One struggle to obey Conscience, when Conscience has been for the time bereft of all her insignia of royalty, when she no longer claims to be vicegerent of an Almighty Lord, nor points with outstretched sceptre to a world where her faithful servants shall be rewarded when their tasks are done—one free and loyal act of obedience to her *then*, will roll back the bars of heaven, as no giant intellectual labours can ever help us to do.

Is this mysterious ? It is the most simple of all the laws of Providence. Moral goodness is the character of God. To love goodness is to love God, in a far deeper, truer sense, than to love any intellectually-conceived idea of a Supreme Being, whether revealed or unrevealed. Man meets God when he feels godlike feelings and performs godlike acts.

He gets above and behind all the secondary, third and thousandth arguments for believing in God, and finds Him at the first and fountain-head of all religious knowledge. Small marvel is it if his doubts thenceforth are banished for ever.

Robertson wrote during the fever of his struggle,

"Moral goodness and moral beauty are realities lying at the base and beneath all forms of religious expression. They are no dream, and they are not mere utilitarian conveniences. That suspicion was an agony once. It is passing away. As to the ministry, I am in infinite perplexity. To give it up seems throwing away the only opportunity of doing good in this short life that is now available to me ; yet to continue when my whole soul is struggling with meaning that I cannot make intelligible, is very wretched."

Returning back to England after some weeks' work at Heidelberg, Robertson accepted from Bishop Wilberforce the charge of St. Ebb's Church, Oxford. How he came to seek employment in such a quarter is hardly accounted for. He was not a High-churchman. "While the Tractarians seemed to say that forms could produce life, he said that forms were necessary only to support life ; but for that they were necessary. Bread cannot create life, but life cannot be kept up without bread." Neither was he a Broad-churchman of that first school which before the era of *Essays and Reviews* was held to represent the widest views in the Church of England. "Though holding Mr. Maurice in veneration, he differed on many and important points both from him and Professor Kingsley. He was the child of no theological father." A few months, however, terminated his labours under the great Tractarian Bishop, and in August, 1847, Robertson accepted the charge of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, the field of his noblest work, the post at which he died.

Trinity Chapel (we speak from the recollection of some five-and-twenty years) is an ugly square building, devoid of a chancel properly so called, and with green niches on either side of the communion-table, the one of course serving as desk, the other as pulpit. It was a drowsy, dreary locality, much favoured by the schools wherewith Brighton abounds. Robertson at once took his part, and preached as he thought and as he felt, awakening many

echoes. "At Oxford he was like the swimmer who has for the first time ventured into deep water; at Brighton he struck out boldly into the open sea." From this time there does not appear to have occurred any essential modifications of his opinions. He continued to speak out freely and with surpassing energy and eloquence, till after six brief years his life burnt itself out, and his place knew him no more. We need not pursue chronologically the order of the few events which diversified his career, but endeavour to put together such materials as are given us for forming a correct idea of the man—his creed and his character, his strength and his weakness.

Mr. Brooke's view of the great work of Robertson is well summed up in the following passage :

"He represented to men, not sharp, distinct outlines of doctrine, but the fulness and depth of the Spirit of Christianity. . . . He cannot be claimed especially by any one of our conflicting parties. But all thoughtful men, however divided in opinion, find in his writings a point of contact. He has been made one of God's instruments to preserve the unity of the Christian Church in this country. . . . But though his teaching was more suggestive than dogmatic, he did not shrink from meeting in the pulpit the difficulties involved in many of the doctrines of the English Church. His explanation of the Atonement, of the doctrine of the sacraments, of absolution, of imputed righteousness, of the freedom of the gospel in contrast to the bondage of the law, have solved the difficulties of many. He believed himself that they were the true solutions. But he also believed that the time might come when they would cease to be adequate solutions. Yet notwithstanding all this, he had a fixed basis for his teaching. It was the Divine-human Life of Christ. He felt that an historical Christianity was absolutely necessary, that only through a visible Life of the Divine in the flesh could God become intelligible to man. . . . The Incarnation was to him the centre of all history."*

The idea which evidently underlies this defence of Robertson's theology, or rather his Christianity without dogmatic theology, is partially true and partially false. It is true that mere intellectual ideas, whether connected or not with religious belief, have in them no power to produce true

* Pp. 167, 168.

unity between human souls. Sentiment unites men ; opinion only serves, at the best, to make partizans and fellow-sectaries. On the other hand, it is false to assume that "sharp, distinct outlines of doctrines" have in them any necessary antagonism to fervent sentiment, or that (according to a belief which seems gaining ground in our day) the more misty is a man's creed, the more warm are likely to be his affections. Our reaction from Calvinistic stiffness is carrying us too far if it persuade us that, to love God much, it is needful to be extremely uncertain regarding all His dealings and attributes. Robertson himself, we suspect, was a proof that "sharp and distinct outlines of doctrine" were no bar to the power of uniting men of various denominations ; for he accomplished that end not by lacking such distinct outlines, but (among other causes) by very distinctly preaching a certain form of Christ-worship attractive to thousands. What he really lacked, in our estimation, was a logical and self-consistent *system*. He had sharply-defined isolated doctrines in abundance.

The peculiar form of Christ-worship to which we have now referred formed so prominent a feature in Robertson's life and religion, as well as in his scheme of theology, that it is needful to give it a very important place in any estimate of him, as well as being in itself a matter deserving the gravest attention of all thinkers of the present age.

Nothing is more remarkable to one who looks over the past and present of Christendom, than to observe how very variously the sentiments of professed Christians towards their common Lord have differed, apparently without the slightest relation to the doctrines they entertained concerning his person and office. The *isothermal* lines (if we may so express it) of love to Christ intersect every altitude of intellect, every latitude of opinion. Or rather we may say, that as in geologic maps all artificial political frontiers and divisions disappear, and, instead of states and provinces, we have districts of granite, of sandstone, chalk or clay,—so in studying Christian Europe beneath the surface, instead of meeting again the great divisions of churches and minor subdivisions of sects, we find a whole new chart, wherewith the superficial lines have little or no connection. Let us take any dozen great religious writers of past times, any dozen more of as many different sectarian denominations

living now—let them all be accounted believers in the actual Deity of Christ—how immeasurably different is yet the place which Christ holds, not in their opinions, but their affections! One man's whole writings are, so to speak, saturated with the love of the great Teacher. Another merely pays him a brief passing homage when the exigencies of his theme seem to demand it. Yet no reader may tell that it is either a plenitude of religious life or a deficiency of it which makes à Kempis so full of Christ, or a Fénelon or Tauler so wrapped in God as to seem well-nigh to forget him. Nay, even among those who dogmatically deny Christ's claim to worship, he assumes a position in some minds so prominent, in others so far in the background, that, to return to our metaphor, the line marking the warmest devotion to him must be made to run half through the Unitarian church, after threading the heights of Romanism and Tractarianism, and descending to the lowest vales of Evangelical and Methodistical opinion. Channing and hundreds of Channing's disciples seem to make up in personal attachment many times more than they deduct from official homage. Even Theists who differ in little else, differ, like Parker and Newman, wide as the poles, when they come to express their sentiments towards him who, to them both, was only the Man of Nazareth.

Among all those who have felt vividly this supreme attraction to Christ's character, Robertson stands eminent. From his first desire to devote himself, like a knight of old, to "military service and the service of Christ," Christ's name seems to have been uppermost in his mind and on his lips; and, as his biographer affirms, he endeavoured to bring *everything*, even the petty worries of Brighton scandal, in some occult way to the test of the life lived in Galilee eighteen centuries ago. He deliberately identified his whole religion with the *worship* of Christ, rather than with the attempt to follow God according to the doctrines of Christ. Christianity in his view is not so much the religion which Christ taught to men (though of course this he would also maintain it to be), as the religion which teaches men about Christ. In one of his sermons (quoted by Mr. Brooke) he says: "In personal love and adoration of Christ the Christian religion consists, and not in a correct morality or a correct doctrine, but in a homage to a King." In

another place he writes to a friend :* "Only a human God and none other must be adored by man." Thus it appears that his reason deliberately ratified the tendency of his feelings. He deliberately made "the Christian religion" (i.e. his own religion) *consist* in "love and adoration," not of God, but of Christ—not in morality, not in true belief, not in allegiance to the Lord of conscience, but in "homage to a King," namely, to Jesus of Nazareth. How far this creed harmonized with his other ideas—how it coincided with that faith in the supremacy of moral good which he must have brought away from that grandest passage of his life, when fidelity to his own sense of Duty and Right alone saved him amid the shipwreck of all his theology—how far the "homage to Christ" could be made the substance of religion by one who had learned *that* lesson—we cannot explain. It remains one of the thousand self-contradictions of the human mind which we are called on only to notice and not to reconcile.

One remark we must be permitted to make ere we leave the subject of Christ-worship in general. Those who, like Robertson, affirm that a "human God and none other must be adored by man," seem in doing so strangely to forget those loftier views of the origin of our knowledge of God which at other moments they earnestly maintain. Has the Divine Father, then, indeed so constituted His children, and so ordered His relation to them, that they can never love Him in His own essential Fatherhood, but only in some "hypostasis" of Sonship or Incarnation? We confess to being somewhat wearied of this doctrine, which we meet in our day from a dozen opposite quarters—a doctrine which out-herods Herod, and would have set the Fathers of the Nicean Council aghast. Men who speak of "a human God only being knowable or adorable by man," seem to have formed for themselves a conception of our mortal life as if it were spent in a dwelling close beside the sea, yet so constructed as that by no door or window, no loophole or crevice, should the inhabitants behold, or be enabled so much as to guess at, the existence of that mighty Deep beneath whose thunder the foundations of their dwelling tremble, and the voice of whose waters is ever sounding in

* Vol. I. p. 290.

their ears. At length—so these teachers would have it—at length a Mariner from the far-off blessed isles has landed on that desolate shore, and said, “Behold the Ocean !”

God did *not* so make for man his tenement of clay. He made therein a window opening out to seaward, a window where, oftentimes kneeling, he may gaze and wonder and adore. The great Mariner indeed has come—many mariners have come—and brought tidings of the boundless expanse, the measureless brightness, of that Ocean of all good. But their tales would be as idle words, could not each one of us for himself look forth and with his own eyes behold the Infinite Deep beside him and around.

To assert that man can only know God as a human God, is tantamount to denying that man has any direct consciousness of Deity. But, setting aside the terrible subtraction of all the deepest part of our religious feelings which *ought* (if men were but logical) to go with such denial, let us consider how such a view can be reconciled with the most familiar facts of human nature. There are in us all, various affections and sentiments, having each their proper objects and, necessarily, their proper means of knowing those objects. One of these affections cannot be substituted or exchanged for another ; for if given a different object, it thereupon becomes a different affection. There is one affection for a parent, another for a child, another for a wife, another for a friend. A parent cannot give a filial affection to his son, nor a wife a parental one to her husband, nor a man a friendly one to an infant. In like manner, there are different affections for human beings and for a Being superhuman. The human affections (like those of which we have spoken) have for their objects our human relatives and friends, all known to us through our bodily senses ; the religious affections have for their object a Divine Being, not known to us through the senses, but through that special organ of consciousness which we have called the Window of the soul which opens on Deity. When Comtists talk of the “Religion of Humanity,” and attempt to attach the religious sentiment to such an abstraction as this idea of Humanity, or to such a concrete image thereof as a dead or living woman, we answer confidently, “Not so—that is not ‘religion.’ Call the sentiment by what name you please, it is not *religion*, any more than conjugal or parental love

is religion. It is another sentiment and must have another name. Religion is a sentiment having for its object an invisible Entity, not an abstraction or a symbol." Just the same answer may be fitly given to Christians who tell us that "a human God" is to be alone adored. A "human God" is not an object of religion at all, but of esteem, honour, human sympathy, or (if such sentiments be transgressed and real adoration offered) then of Idolatry, of the sinful transference of the sentiment due to God alone to an idol, or being having a bodily image. In sober truth, all such wild phrases are self-deceptive. Men feel such a profound love and veneration for Christ, that they seek an infinite expression for their lawful sentiment, and then call it by a name which applies only to the love of God. When they really feel *religion* to Christ, it is when they, like half the Christian world, give his beloved name to "his Father and our Father." For "*Christ*," read "*God in His attributes of Love and Redemption*"—would be the first correction of an immense portion of modern religious literature.

In the case of Robertson, some clue to the meaning of his strange words about a "human God" may perhaps be found where he says,* "What is it to adore Christ? To call him God, and say, Lord, Lord? No. Adoration is *the mightiest love the soul can give*—call it by what name you will. Many a Unitarian, as Channing, has adored, calling it only admiration, and many an orthodox Christian, calling Christ God, with most accurate theology, has given him only a cool intellectual homage." All this is true in a sense, but overlooking the fact on which we have been insisting—that the affections are not interchangeable—that the sentiments duly given to a human being are not the sentiments duly given to God, or vice versa, any more than conjugal and filial and parental affections are interchangeable. Robertson insists only on *degree*. He forgets there is also difference of *kind*, and that to confound them introduces into the religious life a disorder similar to that brought into social life by the misapplication of natural affections.

What Robertson's creed actually was during the later years of his life, it is (strange to say) almost impossible to discover. We meet such curious glimpses of it as these :

* Vol. II. p. 171.

"If you hate evil, you are on God's side, whether there be a personal evil principle or not. *I myself believe there is*, but not so unquestioningly as to be able to say, I think it a matter of clear revelation."*

Again :

"Mr. Robertson was not a universalist in doctrine, however he may have hoped that universalism was true. 'My only difficulty,' he once said to a friend, 'is how *not* to believe in everlasting punishment.'"+

Yet with this possible Devil and probable Hell, Robertson managed to attain views of God so high and devout, that there has surely never been a reader of his Sermons whose heart has not thereby been warmed to more fervent piety, and, above all, to what he so constantly and earnestly inculcated, the effort to make pious feelings lead to holy deeds. His abhorrence of the indulgence of religious emotions as a *luxury* was indeed one of the most marked features of his character, and one which doubtless the popular preacher of a Brighton chapel, no less than the Cheltenham curate, had reason to feel pretty frequently. Undoubtedly, the great secret of his influence lay in the *reality* of his religion. This seems a mere truism at first sight, but when we reflect how much of self-deception—not to speak of the deception of others, "lest we spoil our usefulness"—mingles with the religion of all save the highest and the holiest, it will be confessed that for a man to be in his home what he is in his pulpit, in his heart what he is in his books, in his life what he is in his prayer, is to be real in a sense few may claim.

The great and peculiar glory of Robertson, in our estimation, was his power to discern the living germ of truth in dogmas long wrapped in such hard husks of forms as to need genius like his to break them through and give the seed within power to fructify once more. He deliberately adopted this high task. "I always ask" (he says, in a letter dated May 17, 1851)—"I always ask what does that dogma mean, and how in my language can I put into form the underlying truth, in correcter form if possible, but in only approximative form after all. In this way, Purgatory, Absolution, Mariolatry, become to me fossils, not lies." Every reader of his Sermons must remember how he fulfilled this

* Vol. II. p. 64.

† Vol. II. p. 163.

high purpose, and how under his hand these very doctrines came forth out of the dust of ages beautiful and full of fresh spiritual life. By this means also it happened that Robertson became in so remarkable a degree the harmonizer of men of the most opposite denominations. By his profound insight he was enabled to get at the truth which lies behind Dogma. Now as Truth is one and unchangeable, and Dogma only a distorted image of Truth, refracted by the atmospheres of those human minds through which it has passed and wearing their colours—whether of one century or another, one race, or people, or church, or philosophy—so the setting forth of Truth, once more freed from the discolourations of Dogma, is the most effectual way to unite men who have been kept apart by Dogma. Each now sees that *his* truth is also his neighbour's truth—the same great fact of the religious consciousness, the same idea of God and duty, the same universal phenomenon of the inner life. He perceives that it has only been the Dogma discolouring it which made it appear different. Henceforth, now that each knows the living truth to be the same for himself and his neighbour, he not only feels reconciled to his neighbour, but *united* with him. He learns perfect indulgence for his neighbour's dogma, and much indifference for his own. The root of bitterness is extirpated.

In another manner, also, this particular work confers an immense benefit on mankind. He who can stand before us as the Interpreter of the Past, does much to strengthen all that is best in the Present. In the last century, Protestants and Deists joined in holding up to contempt as utterly valueless those elder dogmas, which, once living and beautiful, had one by one become dead, and then had been embalmed by the Church of Rome and placed like so many saints in her shrines—things to be worshipped by believing and adoring crowds, not rudely uncovered and gazed upon by common mortals. Robertson was perhaps the first and greatest of those who in our age have striven to undo the mischief alike of the Romish embalming, and the contumely wherewith Protestants had torn these mummies from their tombs and made them mere objects of curiosity or derision. He has aided us to see that the men of the primitive ages were men of like passions and like thoughts with ourselves, and that it was much more the *clothing* of their thoughts,

the forms wherewith the mental fashion of that bygone world naturally dressed them, than any real difference in the thoughts themselves which distinguish them from our own. To feel this thoroughly is to resume the heirlooms of our race, to feel ourselves the "heirs of all the ages," the lawful inheritors of wisdom doubly precious because tested by the currency of millenniums. The philosophy of the eighteenth century believed itself of mushroom birth, and adopted all the rude airs of an upstart. The better philosophy of the nineteenth seeks to attach itself to the noblest names in the spiritual pedigree of the human race, and speaks with somewhat of the calm dignity of one who, though far surpassing his fathers, yet deems himself to come of goodly stock and worthy parentage.

On the other hand, there are not a few dangers connected with this rehabilitating of discredited dogmas—dangers, above all, to candour and simplicity. From these, however, Robertson was nobly—we had almost written, splendidly—exempt. No one could tax him with "putting new wine into old bottles," in the spirit of that Janus-preaching we hear so often; one face for those who adhere to the Past, and one for those who aspire to the Future. He was beyond the suspicion of tampering with the purest simplicity of the truth, as he understood it; nay, he seemed to desire to find always to express his thoughts, not old consecrated words which remain for ever burdened with first associations, but the freshest phrases of English life of to-day wherein his meaning might be absolutely transparent. One other great service did Robertson do for us. He taught in a thousand forms the truth, best expressed in one of his Sermons, where he says that the Vineyard is made indeed for the culture of vines, but if vines be found healthy and full of fruit *outside* the vineyard, they are none the less therefore to be accounted true vines. Perhaps the relation of the Church to the individual soul was never more happily exemplified. Brought home, as by Robertson's eloquence, to a thousand hearts, we all owe much, and shall year by year owe more, to this lesson, gradually spread among minds whose orthodox creed would formerly have seemed to be a wall of partition forbidding them to recognize any test of Divine Sonship in those who "followed not us"—any fruit in the vines which grow outside the vineyard.

With pleasure we see from this Biography that practically he felt no less than preached such liberalism. We read,* "He revered and spoke of Dr. Channing as one of the truest and noblest Christians of America. He was deeply indebted to his writings." And again: "He read James Martineau's books with pleasure and profit. The influence of 'The Endeavours after the Christian Life' may be traced through many of his sermons. Theodore Parker he admired for his eloquence, earnestness, learning and indignation against evil, and against forms without a spirit, which mark his writings. But he deprecated the want of reverence and the rationalizing spirit of Parker."†

We must pass briefly over the private character of this noble man. The Biography we are reviewing, in spite of all its warm eulogiums and discriminating criticisms, will probably be felt by most readers to leave much to be desired in the filling up of the picture of Robertson's character. We are assured, by those who personally and intimately knew Mr. Robertson, that he was a most warm-hearted man, capable of strong attachment, and we can hardly think his biographer has done wisely in eliminating so completely the traces, or at least all means of identifying the traces, of the friendships of his manhood from these volumes.

In a most vigorous defence of Tennyson from the charge of overstrained enthusiasm for Arthur Hallam, he says:

"The friendship of a school-boy is as full of tenderness and jealousy and passionateness as even love itself. I remember my own affection for G. R. M. How my heart beat at seeing him; how the consciousness that he was listening while I was reading annihilated the presence of the master; how I fought for him; how to rescue him at prisoner's base turned the effect of mere play into a ferocious determination, as if the captivity were real; how my blood crept cold with delight when he came to rescue me or when he praised me."‡

Yet, after his boyhood, we are hardly admitted to guess even the names of those he loved best. He details continually to his anonymous correspondents little circumstances of his life which read like the pictures drawn for a friend's

* Vol. II. p. 171.

† We cannot pause to answer, for the thousandth time, the imputation conveyed in the last paragraph.

‡ P. 81.

perusal of the life of an invalid woman, but the passages which should account for such pages are withheld. Again, we are assured, by those who knew him best, that he displayed great gentleness and magnanimity regarding the misrepresentations and slanders heaped on him. The printed fragments of letters unfortunately recall what, in such case, must have been almost his sole utterances of indignation, weariness and complaint. These are, doubtless, unfortunate results of a system which yet it is probable the biographer was justified in following. At least his own testimony, and that of many who knew Robertson more intimately, should be generally known, to absolve him from suspicions of weakness which these severed fragments may suggest to many readers.

We are told by Mr. Brooke that Robertson's eloquence became obvious from the first sermon he ever preached. He was eloquent in the best sense—rich in thoughts, as well as in words to clothe his thoughts. His voice was fine, his person (it is said) even unfortunately handsome. The photograph and the bust give the idea of a man too slender of make, with too narrow chest and drooping shoulders, and a head too high and defective in depth to make such storms of emotions as he habitually underwent otherwise than perilous. To use Kingsley's phrase, there was a complete lack of "healthy animalism" about his head and figure. To compensate for this, however, he was soldier-like in bearing as in taste; "muscular" before the term became the cant name for his school of theology. Nay, he was not only a soldier, he was also to the backbone a sportsman. We have heard a woman remark that a true *man* never enjoys a walk in the country during which he has not had the chance of *killing something*. Without discussing this supposed evidence of manliness, we confess to a little pain at finding Robertson writing, that "as he had not a gun" he could not discover what some sea-gulls were eating, and that even these beautiful and harmless sea-birds, which a Turk deems it sin and pity to destroy, would not have been safe from his slaughter. Robertson's love of sport, indeed, led him very far. With his sisters one after another dying of consumption and his own constitution continually threatened, we read that "he would walk for hours after a single bird, and reluctantly leave off the pursuit of this coy grouse when night began

to fall. He would sit for hours in a barrel sunk in the border of a marsh waiting for wild ducks. *These hours of delight* (says his biographer) he obtained once a year.* All, doubtless, very manly and "muscular," but a curious study withal! A great Teacher and Reformer sitting "for hours in a barrel sunk in a marsh," and counting the time spent in such durance as "hours of delight," is a spectacle at which the un-sporting mind stands by in amazement.

Robertson's feelings about women form a remarkable feature in his character. In his early boyhood he seems to have had a sort of worship for them, like that of an old knight of romance. Later in life, a high and most pure tenderness of feeling marks almost all his intercourse. In one letter he remarks, "I rather agree with the view of St. Paul having taken personally a low estimate of women. It seems to me inseparable from his temperament. . . . That respectful chivalry of feeling which characterizes some men can only exist where that is found which St. Paul lacked." In another letter soon afterwards, he says: "In the estimate formed of women, I should think there cannot be a doubt which is the truer and deeper, that which makes her a plaything, or that which surrounds her with the sacredness of a silent worship. A temperament like that of St. Paul's is happier, and for the world more useful." It is truly amazing (to a woman) to think that to such a man as Robertson there was no medium between a "plaything" and a being "surrounded with the sacredness of a silent worship," and that while considering the latter view "truer and deeper," he attributed the "plaything" theory to the great apostle of the Gentiles, and considered it (though less true and deep) "happier, and for the world more *useful*!" The "usefulness" of making half the human race playthings for the other half is surely open to some discussion! Again, this man, with his "sacred and silent worship," did not shrink from attributing to the objects of this "worship" a corruption and baseness which we may venture to say few women could hear of without indignation. He writes: "I do believe that a secret leaning towards sin, and a secret feeling of provocation and jealousy towards those who have enjoyed what they dare not, lies at the bottom of half the

censorious zeal for morality which we hear. I am nearly sure it is so with women in their virulence against their own sex; *they feel malice because they envy them.*"* A virtuous woman malicious against a poor fallen one *because she envies her*, seems to us rather an unworthy object of "the sacredness of a silent worship,"—nay, even of being made the "plaything" of an honest man. Will men never have done with this jargon of inflated and impossible reverence; this under-current of vilest mistrust and contempt?

When Robertson was a boy, he is recorded to have been full of life and gaiety, but from the time he grew up he appears to have been constantly subject to morbid depression. At first there were alternating fits of cheerfulness and gloom; but at last he seems to have deliberately justified himself in condemning mirth and adopting a fixed melancholy. In one place, after a touching description of the sufferings of a poor soul he had visited, he says, incidentally of his general habit, "My laugh is now a ghastly, hollow, false lie of a thing."† In another place, detailing a meeting of men assembled to thank him for his instructions, he says, "The applause was enthusiastic, yet all seemed weary, flat, stale and unprofitable. In the midst of the homage of a crowd, I felt alone and as if friendless."‡ Again, in 1852, he writes: "All was warm and effervescing once, now all is cold and flat. If a mouse could change into a frog, would the affections be as warm as before, albeit they might remain unalterable? I trow not; so I only say you have as much as a cold-blooded animal can give, whose pulsations are something like one per minute." Again, we are told: "He also felt deep sympathy with that want of the sense of the ridiculous in Wordsworth, which made all the world, even to its meanest things, a consecrated world. *The ludicrous now rarely troubles me*, he says; all is awful."§ It would be hard, we venture to think, to put more deplorable and distorted ideas into one sentence. That the *want* of a sense could be a subject of congratulation—a sense the source of incalculable innocent gratification, the corrector of all taste, the true correlative of the sense of the sublime, to which it bears the relationship which tenderness does to strength—to rejoice in the loss of this God-given aid to

* P. 283. † Vol. II. p. 58. ‡ Vol. II. p. 107. § Vol. II. p. 175.

cheer us over the stony places of life, and then to sit down and say that this sense rarely *troubles* him, for "all is awful," is (to our humble thinking) to fall into some of the worst errors of Calvinism.

Shall we be pardoned if we write of a contrast suggested to us by these expressions, and by those of distaste for his work, of morbid annoyance at the attacks of the Record newspaper, and, lastly, of continual longing to end his task and die? There was another Reformer who died soon after Robertson, worn out like him in the prime of manhood by his labours. He also was abused and vilified, more cruelly than Robertson, for life and limb were often in his case in peril. There was in his home-life a want Robertson never felt, which the other felt keenly—the absence of children. Taking all in all, in outward circumstances there was not much to choose as to happiness between one lot and the other. But let any one take up the Biography of Theodore Parker (not comparable as a literary work to that of Robertson), and read page after page telling of his joy in his work—his gratitude to God when his labours were blessed by helping, perchance, some poor backwoodsman, some stranger far away—his manly scorn of danger and actual *good-humour* to those who reviled and threatened him—his joyousness of spirit, revelling in innocent jest and mirthfulness to the last—let them read his letters, overflowing with friendliness and tenderness to brother, wife, teacher, friend, disciple, as if his heart were a very treasure-house of all the kindly emotions—let them watch him at last when his health failed and he left his place in sorrow, wishing yet to spend and be spent—desiring to live, for "the world was so interesting and friends so dear," and dying at last with the words (spoken to the writer) on his lips, "I am not afraid to die, but I would fain have lived to finish my work; I had great powers; I have but half used them:"—let them compare these lives and these feelings on the verge of the grave, and then say *whose* was the healthier creed, the sounder thought of God and human destiny? We must not press such parallels far. There is ever injustice in doing so; and the law by which the joyous nature chooses a joyful creed and is thereby for ever confirmed in its joyousness, and the depressed and morbid mind chooses a sad creed and is thereby made more morbid, had probably never stronger

exemplification than in the case of the sturdy New-England farmer's son and the over-sensitive English gentleman. Parker had a hero's soul in a body which, till he thoroughly wore it out, fairly bore its part in the great "give and take" of matter and spirit. Robertson had an angelic soul, apparently never fitted to bear this world's jars and struggles, lodged in a body where every nerve was strung to torture, and brain disease seemed to be indigenous. To ask of the two the same bearing, the same spirit, would be unjust. Yet must it remain at least as the lesson of the two Biographies, that the religious faith which animated the life of Parker and upheld him in death was pre-eminently the healthiest conceivable in all its results; and that the belief adopted by the devout and noble-hearted Robertson left him, on the other hand, to a condition of feeling and a view of human life which may almost be qualified as morbid. Is it not allowable to ask, Was not such difference, *in a measure* at least, the legitimate result of the difference of their creeds in that one supreme point whereon they separated? Was not the joyous trust, the love of his work, the delight in success, the carelessness of rebuke, the longing to live, which characterized the one—and the gloom and depression which hung over the other—both the *natural* results of their opinions? The one saw, as the central Power of the universe, a radiant Sun of Light and Love, "with whom was no darkness at all;" and the other beheld an awful vision of blackened heavens and rending graves, and over all, upon the torturing Cross, an Agonizing God!

FRANCES POWER CORBE.

III.—THE CHARITIES OF EUROPE.

Six Months among the Charities of Europe. By John de Liefde. 2 vols. London: Alexander Strahan. 1865.

WHETHER the Charitable Institutions of the Continent are on the whole so largely indebted to the influence of English liberality and sympathy as Mr. de Liefde supposes,

VOL. III.

E

may be open to question ; but there can be no doubt that his book will be read in this country with extreme interest. He has chosen a theme of the most solemn and touching character. He invites us to accompany him on his journeys of observation, and to contemplate with him the spirit of Christ still impelling the faithful and the humane to seek out the lost of all kinds with intent to save them. And he bids us recognize in this very spirit of positive benevolence one of the surest proofs of the divine origin of Christianity, one of its peculiar distinctions among the religions of the world. His narrative is full of well-digested information on the state and prospects of the poor in various countries. It is, therefore, of great practical value to all who desire to work intelligently for the relief and diminution of pauperism. Mr. de Liefde began his visits to the principal charities of the continent in 1863. It took him about two months to visit ten of them, some of which were situated in remote corners of Germany. He inspected altogether twenty-six institutions, from the printed reports of which, aided by his own notes, he has described fifteen in the present volumes.

Our space will not permit us to do more than sketch, with the author's aid, a few typical examples out of the long list comprised in the work, and to give some more general account of his observations in other cases. We have selected for more particular notice the five following institutions, viz., the Rauhe Haus at Horn, Father Zeller's School at Beuggen, Pastor Bräm's Family System at Neukirchen, the Agricultural Colony at Rijsselt, commonly called the Netherland Mettray, and the establishments of Mr. Bost, for poor girls, idiots and incurables, at Laforce.

The reader is first introduced to the Rauhe Haus, which Mr. de Liefde visited in November 1864. The description which he gives of this remarkable institution is one of the most interesting of the kind we have ever read.* The Rauhe Haus, or more properly *Ruge Hoos*, is situated at Horn, a little village about half an hour's drive from Hamburg. It is no longer a single house, but a colony comprising a number of buildings, with gardens and woodland

* Further details may be found in Stevenson's "Praying and Working," pp. 61—196. Referred to by Mr. de Liefde.

and fields. Each house has a picturesque character of its own; each bears some fanciful or suggestive designation, such as, "The Green Fir," "The Beehive," "The Fishers' Cottage," "The Swallows' Nests," &c. The original Rauhe Haus is a venerable cottage, with thatched roof and wood-framed walls, sheltered under the broad foliage of a gigantic chestnut-tree. Here it was that Dr. Wichern, then a young candidat (i.e. licensed to take orders), and his mother, and the first boys whom he rescued from moral perdition, spent their happy years, till the house became full, and a second and a third and a twelfth were built. Statistics of 1848 shew that out of every five children born in Hamburg, one was illegitimate. In the cities of the continent generally this evil had during the early part of this century assumed quite appalling dimensions. Falck at Weimar, Zeller at Beuggen, and Count von der Recke Volmerstein at Overdyk, had already established *Rettungshäuser*, that is to say, refuges for the neglected children of destitute and profligate parents. Stimulated by their noble example and taught by his own experience as a Sunday-school teacher and a visitor of the poor, Dr. Wichern resolved to found a House of Refuge for such children, which, while near enough to Hamburg, should be situated away from its temptations, in the *country*, "where fresh air and wholesome labour would invigorate the body, and a Christian family life, carried on with patriarchal simplicity, would revive the spirit." He opened his mind to his friends, members of the Visiting Society—"men like himself, richer in faith and love than in silver and gold." At length the hearts of some wealthy persons were moved to help them with house and lands and money. After many strange disappointments and no less singular rewards of their patient faith, a Society was formed, and in 1833 Dr. Wichern, with his mother, entered the Rauhe Haus, to begin the great work to which he had been divinely called. He collected about him twelve boys of the lowest class and the worst character, lived with them, slept with them, ate with them, worked and prayed with them, and treated them in all respects as his own *family*. This, indeed, was the fundamental principle of his system and the talisman of his success. He taught the boys, by loving them as a father, that they had a Father in heaven, who at once hates sin and loves the sinner. And because

"Satan finds some mischief still
For idle hands to do,"

he turned the mental and animal energies of his young pupils into channels of useful enterprise. He set them to make benches and tables for the house, to bake the bread, mend the shoes, lay out the garden, and a hundred other things which boys were sure to approve.

"Regular labour in the field and in the workshop soon came to be liked as a recreation, and the school-teaching as an amusement. Freedom, too, was honoured as a queen. That ugly earth-bank, which enclosed the place like a prison, was dug away amid loud hurrahs. Everybody could run away now whenever he liked. But nobody did, or the few who tried came back of their own accord. They found after all that the *Ruge Hoos* was the best place anybody could dream of."*

From the *family* system Wichern resolutely refused to depart. The institution was enlarged of necessity, but it was by the building of other houses managed on the same principle; and thus there arose "The Swiss House," "The Green Fir," "The Beehive," and others, all peopled with little families of boys or girls. Great was the ceremony and great the rejoicing when a new house was opened. The anniversary of the foundation of each was also kept as a festival, and the histories of the several houses were collected into "The Festival Book," from which the children once a year learnt the story of the origin and progress of their particular homes and of the whole community. Labour, worship and recreation, judiciously blended, secured for every one, barring accidents, the inestimable blessing of a sound mind in a sound body. For every one some congenial occupation was found, either shoe-making, or joinery, or tailoring, or wool-spinning, or baking bread, or field and garden work. By daily contact with healthy nature in healthy modes of activity, the boys gradually lost the taint of their old associations, and seemed to be born again into a totally new life. From their workshops in "The Gold Bottom"† they could see the pretty chapel, erected in 1839, and feel their honest toil consecrated by the neighbouring spirit of

* Vol. I. p. 13.

† "Der Goldene Boden," so called in allusion to the German proverb which says, "Labour has a golden bottom."

prayer. They had helped in the building of four houses ; and when the fifth was required, the forty-three boys then in the establishment, varying in age from ten to twenty-two years, built it with their own hands ; and they afterwards built several more. Nothing could daunt the enthusiasm of the boys, or the tried faith and zeal of their friends. Thoughtful persons in Hamburg looked on with wonder and gratitude, while the Rauhe Haus grew to such magnificent proportions. Even when the city was burnt down in 1842, the charitable efforts of the Brethren never halted for want of support. Time after time supplies mysteriously came to meet their needs, until they could no longer doubt the special interference of Providence and the direct efficacy of their prayers. In 1851, Dr. Wichern removed to a house built for him by public subscription close to the Rauhe Haus Park. The Rev. Mr. Riehm henceforth acted as manager of the institution under Dr. Wichern's superintendence, who was thus set at liberty to bestow his valuable services in other places where they might be of use. The Prussian Government gladly appointed him to superintend the moral and religious concerns of prisons and of institutions for the poor. Consequently he spends the winter in Berlin ; but his summer months are still passed at the Rauhe Haus in the midst of the children, who, as may be imagined, love and revere him beyond all bounds. Indeed, what with the affectionate intercourse between old and young, the variety of occupation, combined with regularity of method,—what with the “Song-feasts” and the “Labour-feasts,” and numerous other opportunities of social enjoyment,—life in the Rauhe Haus must be a very pleasant thing.

“Earnestness and cheerfulness, strict order and liberty, go hand in hand. The *Friedensknabe*, or ‘Boy of Peace,’ who is elected by the unanimous consent of all the members of the family, is their leader, arbiter and counsellor, in the emergencies of their daily life. Over him stands a Brother, a young man, who is the house-father. He is one of a band of six or seven young men who live with the family under the same roof ; he shares their meals and sports, and trains them for an orderly life in the spirit of the Gospel. A Candidat of Theology also lives with them, under the title of *Oberhelfer*, or ‘upper assistant.’ He forms the link between the family and Wichern. Thus the whole organiza-

tion assumes a pyramidal form ; and through the medium of all its intervening links Wichern can exercise the strictest control over each child, and send down his impulse to the most distant member."*

The family, not the trade, is the basis of union. All trades, all ages, and all characters, are represented in each household, after the manner of nature. A wholesome rivalry in what is good and honourable prevails amongst the various groups, but the home-feeling is guarded from degenerating into clannishness.

Those who know something of missionary undertakings in large cities are well aware that the chief difficulty is, not so much to create a desire in many minds to render active help, as *to find out* the persons who are already willing and anxious to give it, to bring the labourers and the work together. This problem Dr. Wichern solved by establishing a society called "The Brethren of the Rauhe Haus." Six or seven young men of the artizan or teacher class lived for two or three years with the children in each family-house, watching over their education and teaching them some trade which they themselves had previously learnt. They formed an order subjected to a strict rule and supported by a distinct fund. They were held to be in training for the work of the Home Mission at large, and furnished house-fathers or assistants for reformatories, visitors of the poor, teachers for popular schools, managers or assistants for workhouses, orphanages, prisons, hospitals, &c. Government allowed grants for the training of gaol officers and schoolmasters. And to the credit of the Brethren, it must be stated that their services have been eagerly sought for, not only in Germany, but in all parts of the world. They are absolutely dependent on the direction of Dr. Wichern and his Committee ; they must go whithersoever they are sent. On the other hand, their *status* is assured in the public eye, they are strengthened by a vigorous *esprit de corps*, they receive the highest training for their work, their minds are relieved from care as to their own support and that of their wives and families, if they have any, and their self-devotion is not irrevocably fettered by a monastic vow. They submit to a thorough

* Vol. I. p. 48.

organization for the sake of the good which hence results ; but they wear no uniform and are too busy to think of "playing at monks." They are permitted to marry, if they live out of the Rauhe Haus and are in a position to support a wife and family. They are divided into groups, called *convicts* (Lat. *convivere*), each group having a candidat of theology assigned to it as *Oberhelfer*. He is their teacher in Biblical history, universal history, geography, natural philosophy, &c. To this instruction twenty-five hours a week are given. The candidat also controls the school-teaching of the children. Of sixty-five kandidaten who had lived with the *convicts* from the commencement of the society till 1861, twenty-eight became directors of charities or chaplains of prisons. Great caution is exercised in the admission of a young man as brother. Out of 846 who applied during a period of twenty-five years (from 1836—61), 524 were refused. It is almost needless to add that the demand for their services after training, immensely exceeds the supply. When the typhus fever, after a terrible famine, raged in Silesia in 1848, and again when the Danish-German war broke out almost at their very doors, the Brethren faced both perils with all the intrepidity of men whose burning Christian love had cast out the last particle of fear. They nursed the sick, consoled the mourner and comforted the dying. The pestilence and the battle only served to shew them where their duty lay. It must be a blessing to any country to possess such an organization, by which one man has at his disposal a band of from 250 to 300 able, well-trained and devoted young men whom he can send where he chooses, to fill any post which stands in need of them.

But the nature of the Rauhe Haus Brotherhood can only be comprehended in connection with a much larger scheme elaborated by Dr. Wichern, and entitled "The Inner Mission of the German Evangelical Church." It is more comprehensive than what we understand by Home Missions, embracing in fact the whole area of German Christendom. It aims, in one phrase, to bring back the stray sheep to the fold of Christ. It addresses itself, therefore, not to Jews, or Heathens, or Mohammedans, but those who are of Christian parentage and belong *de jure* to the Church. The regular clergy had failed to stem the tide of profligacy, ignorance and infidelity, which had overflowed the country districts as well as the

towns of Germany. A large scheme was required by which the evil might be encountered all over the land—by which teachers, taken from the people and inspired with fresh apostolic zeal and humility, might be trained for the work of rescuing the million from moral and spiritual death. Dr. Wichern's plan of a Society for this end was adopted at an influential meeting of members of the Government, clergymen, professors and others, in 1848; but only part of the organization then proposed has actually been carried out. The Central Board has not yet been followed by the Parish Committees, the District Boards, the Provincial Courts, &c., which formed part of the original design. Nevertheless, the Inner Mission has drawn into itself much of the scattered philanthropic efforts of the German people, and given them a higher degree of efficiency, by the economy of force which centralization, with all its drawbacks, secures. Other bodies of Christian labourers are connected with this systematic Mission, but the original conception is most perfectly realized by the Brotherhood of the Rauhe Haus, who are trained to obey a central authority, from which, so long as they remain Brethren, there is no appeal.

We only hope that Dr. Wichern has found some way of saving spontaneity of religion in the midst of all this formidable discipline, this somewhat terrible completeness of organization. We confess to a misgiving here, which is not a little increased by the glimpse which is afforded into the family worship of the Rauhe Haus. Our heart sinks within us when we see what the children have to go through under the name of worship. All the inmates of the establishment, about 200, are assembled at least once a day in the chapel. They are arranged in the order of their baptism and communion. Their attention is kept up by a rather complex liturgy, interwoven with annual, weekly and daily texts or sentences, which are regularly repeated. After the singing of a hymn, a text is drawn from a lottery by the house-father. Then three boys read three other texts; and after a prayer the annual texts are read. Each children's family, and each Brethren's "convict," has its own text for the year; and so also has the band of candidatens. Then two boys and two girls repeat one of the five chapters of Luther's short Catechism. More texts, then a hymn and silent prayer, an exposition of a part of Scripture, commemoration

of birthdays and baptismal days (both improved by texts) and other anniversaries, a short address, and the Lord's Prayer, with a hymn, complete this hour-long children's service. On some days a shorter service is held, and the evening worship lasts only twenty minutes. Is it possible that a kind of worship which looks so uninteresting to man can be wholly pleasing to God? You may drill young minds into a certain religiosity by an incessant routine of texts, but can you drill them into a true heart-religion so? We doubt it. With unmixed pleasure we notice that the children are allowed to play, and to walk out, "not in files, but in perfect freedom, like the children of any other family." Sometimes their parents come to see them, and sometimes they go to town to visit their parents, who are thus brought within the circle of the Brotherhood's influence. When a child is admitted, the parents agree not to interfere with its education, nor to visit it without the permission of the Director. At the expiration of their term, the boys are apprenticed to master-tradesmen, and the girls are sent to respectable service. Not a few of the *Rauhhäusler* have risen to higher positions. The number of the children living at the House during 1863 was on an average 98, one-third of them girls. The girls are under the care of "Sisters" and the general direction of Mrs. Riehm; they are thus taught house-work and sewing, as well as the usual subjects of the school. But here we must pause in our account of this noble institution. We have been tempted from point to point to describe facts which may be useful, and cannot fail to be interesting, to our philanthropic readers. We will only add that the Rauhe Haus has been the prolific parent of many charitable undertakings, more or less resembling itself, in Germany and in other countries. Of these, one of the most important is the institution of St. John (*Johannesstiftung*) at Berlin.

Confining our attention to those charities which have for their object the welfare of necessitous children, we will now state some of the leading facts given by Mr. de Liefde concerning Father Zeller's School at Beuggen, near Basel, established in 1820, thirteen years before Dr. Wichern began his undertaking at Horn. In this year the Castle of Beuggen, which had done good service in time of war as stronghold, head-quarters, and lastly as military hospital, was

converted into an asylum for neglected children, under the directorship of Christian Heinrich Zeller. The moral evils which Napoleon's wars inflicted on Europe were still fresh. The lower classes were sunk in abject misery and neglect; the children especially suffered; and a whole generation seemed to be growing up with no prospect but the life of paupers and vagabonds. Foreign missions were a mockery in the face of such an urgent need at home. Zeller, then a highly popular school-director at Zofingen, took the subject deeply to heart; and, conjointly with his friend Mr. Spittler, formed at Basel, in 1817, a "Society for Training Voluntary Schoolmasters for the Poor." They proposed "to take a number of poor, fatherless and neglected children into a spacious, well-appointed building, situated in the country, and not too far from Basel, where they should be instructed in the most important branches of elementary education, in gardening and domestic labour, and in various kinds of handicrafts. In connection with this, a band of Christian young men should be trained as teachers of poor children." Their design was well supported in Switzerland and Germany; the British and Foreign School Society of London helped them with a donation of £100, and the Grand Duke of Baden leased to them the Castle of Beuggen at a nominal rent. The story of their early difficulties, and of that pure Christian love which both incurred and surmounted them, must be sought in the first volume of Mr. de Liefde's work. The following extract from Father Zeller's first annual report will give an interesting view of the methods of training and teaching adopted by him for the pupil-teachers:

"Twelve months ago we had nothing but this house with its empty rooms. It is now inhabited by seventy persons, forty-seven of whom are children, and thirteen pupil-teachers. We have hired twelve *jucharten* (about sixty acres) of land. One part of it is in grass, a second is in potatoes, and the third is an orchard. Thus we eat what the hands of our pupil-teachers and elder children have cultivated, and what God has blessed. We have now three horned-cattle in the cow-house, and three beehives in the garden. Sixteen sheep, watched and cared for by one of our children, wander about on heath and meadow. Their wool clothes the brethren and the children. The younger boys spin; some of the brethren and the older boys weave the wool, and our tailors make coats of it. Some of the brethren are our shoe-

makers, others our joiners. Thus we labour together as one family. As to corn, leather, flax, thread, linen and timber, we must buy them. But the Lord has not for one week allowed our box to be empty.”*

Such a discipline effectually repressed all vain and ambitious motives in the teachers. They were constantly reminded that they were destined to be the poor, hard-working instructors of the *poor*, ready, if need be, to earn part of their livelihood with their own hands. As a matter of fact, they came from the peasant and operative classes; richer people gave their money and their applause. Yet great caution was exercised in the admission of recruits for the work, and no pains were spared to make them really good teachers, Zeller's motto being, “Better no school-master at all than a bad one.”

No time is wasted at Beuggen. The inmates are roused at five by the sound of a hymn. They breakfast at six, and, if the weather be fine, separate till seven, the older and stronger boys for garden-work, the younger for study. At seven, the whole household assemble for family worship. At eight, twenty-five of the boys are set to work in the garden or the field; the girls sew, knit and spin; while the pupil-teachers and elder boys are instructed by the house-father in reading, grammar, history, geography, writing, drawing, spelling, music, singing, the art of teaching, and the principles of religion. This continues till the bell rings for dinner at a quarter to twelve. After dinner the pupil-teachers and elder boys labour in the field, garden or workshops, till four; and the little ones are taught by a master and five monitors in the school-room. The afternoon meal is at four. Then labour is resumed from five to seven. At six the catechumens receive their preparatory Biblical instruction from the house-father. The children take their supper at seven and go to bed. The adults sup an hour later, and after supper occupy themselves with various kinds of domestic work, while the house-father reads to them something of an edifying or interesting nature. At nine the day is closed with singing, prayer and exhortation. “The blooming countenances, and happy, merry looks of the children, tell that their day's work itself is their pas-

* Vol. I. p. 208.

time." Certainly they have very little other play ; but the hours are well saturated with religious admonition and comfort. The children who have left the establishment for the most part turn out well, even if they do not become Christians in the stringent sense. When they write back to their old home, they acknowledge their debt to the Bible class in particular, and almost all of them agree that the "third seven years" of their life have been the worst and most dangerous. Hence it would seem desirable to retain the children till their twenty-first year. Judging from data carried down to 1843, 70 per cent. of those admitted were known to have been successfully redeemed for human society. On the other hand, 10 per cent. had turned out failures, and of the remaining 20 per cent. nothing certain was known. It was Zeller's experience that children of vicious mothers and of illegitimate connections are much harder to be saved and trained than others. The Beuggen establishment publishes no list of subscribers and no balance-sheet. The annual charge for each child is £6, to be paid either by parents, relatives, societies, friends or benefactors. The age of admission is from eight to thirteen—of quitting the establishment, sixteen. Pupil-teachers on admission are required to have thoroughly learned some trade, to be possessed of natural teaching power, and to have a love and some knowledge of the Scriptures. They must be between twenty and twenty-five. They must, at the end of their course, go wherever the committee think proper. Father Zeller died in 1860, and was succeeded by his son, the Rev. Reinhardt Zeller, who continues the work in the same spirit in which it was conducted by his venerable predecessor. "Between forty and fifty establishments for the poor have been erected in Switzerland and Germany, on the model of the Beuggen School, in consequence of Father Zeller's incessant exhortations and appeals."

A favourite notion which haunted Zeller's mind was, that one or more neglected children should be adopted by each truly Christian family, and thus be more effectually redeemed in detail than could possibly be done on the wholesale principle of special establishments. In his own, the family principle was cherished and respected as far as possible. But every effort short of actual adoption into natural families he regarded as only a temporary makeshift.

It will be seen that the good old man's dream has been practically carried out by Pastor Bräm's Society at Neukirchen, near Moers. Local authorities and guardians of the poor had already been in the habit of boarding out orphans and foundlings, on the lowest terms. Sometimes the foster parents received them for good, even used them for begging purposes, and otherwise treated the children like slaves. The practice had, therefore, fallen into disrepute when Pastor Bräm commenced his work. He had to travel about the country and explain his views, before he could make them popular. But his most effectual argument was produced when, in the spring of 1845, he actually placed twenty-five children with nine suitable families. The experiment proved an unanswerable success. In December of the same year, he formed, in conjunction with a few friends, a "Society for the Education of Poor Abandoned and Neglected Children in Christian Families." Two objects were contemplated by this scheme: the natural training of the children amid the peculiar influences of real family life, and the spiritual benefit of the Christian families themselves, in which the children were to receive a proper religious education. It is, of course, a highly delicate matter of discretion to choose the right families and the right moment for bestowing upon them the care of a neglected child. Both families and children are well looked after by the Society, and every encouragement is given to the parents who have undertaken so noble and hazardous a duty. Pastor Bräm is assisted in this work of visiting by a young candidat, who acts as a travelling agent for that special purpose. The families, scattered through the provinces of Westphalia and Rhenish Prussia, numbered in 1860 sixty-five. They were visited four times during the year by the agent, who has also the duty of extending the area of the system, forming Branch Societies, and collecting subscriptions. The work is greatly assisted by other members and friends, especially by the female portion of them. Pastor Bräm thus explains the relation of his own system to that of the Establishments:

"We may divide the children which require redemption into three classes, viz., 1st, those who are *thoroughly neglected*, with whom sin has become an inveterate custom, and vice has developed itself into a horrible dexterity; 2nd, those with whom

neglect has only commenced, mostly young children from four to eight, left without control at home, or taken along by their wretched parents for begging purposes; 3rd, *abandoned children* who are left to themselves, without control or guidance, and consequently are in great danger of becoming neglected altogether. Now, we find that the first of these three classes, the thoroughly neglected, are not fit for our families, but require to be trained at establishments. We dare not demand of our families to take in thoroughly neglected children. Their kind willingness is a gift of God which we must thankfully appreciate, not inconsiderately trespass upon. So, on the whole, we have limited ourselves chiefly to those children which are only abandoned or in danger of being lost, though it is not always easy to draw the line of demarcation between them and the thoroughly neglected ones. We also have found that the character and moral disposition of the child often renders it necessary to take refuge in an establishment."*

There can be no doubt that family education is the best whenever it can be applied. In order to be fitted for their social duties, children ought preferably to be trained in those mixed social relations in which by Divine Providence they have been placed. If they are separated from the evil of a wicked home, they need all the more the moulding atmosphere of a good home, and only in special cases the uniform routine of an establishment. Nor will it escape the reader's notice that the best of these establishments, the Rauhe Haus and the School at Beuggen for instance, approach the family system as nearly as they can. So deeply convinced was Pastor Bräm that he had found the right principle in this matter, that he wanted the churches to carry it earnestly into effect in every parish, and find out the families suitable to undertake their share of the holy work. If every church and every presbytery did its part, then the poor unfortunate children might be cared for, with few exceptions, in the very place where they were born. He is averse to the removal of children from the midst of their natural relations and neighbours, if it can be helped. The laws and machinery of the Society are very simple. Pastor Bräm, the President, assisted by a friend who acts as Treasurer, manages the finances, disbursing an annual income of about £850. "The master of a family receives

for the boarding and lodging of a child a remuneration varying according to his wants and circumstances." The patron of the child, when it has one, is expected to contribute an annual sum of £5. 8s. towards its maintenance, any deficiency or further expense being borne by the Society. The average cost of a child comes to about £6. 15s. a year. In 1862, there were 112 children still under the Society's care, placed in 79 families, 165 had been sent out, or back to their own parents, and 38 were in apprenticeship or service. The income for the same year was about £855, and the expenditure £861.

At Rijsselt, near Zutphen, there is an Agricultural Colony for indigent and neglected boys, which was formed on the model of a similar one at Mettray, and hence commonly goes by the name of the Netherland Mettray. This valuable institution owes its origin to the judicious and patriotic zeal of Mr. Willem Hendrick Suringar, of Amsterdam, who, in 1845, when fifty-five years old, visited the French colony, and was so impressed by what he saw, that he resolved to establish one like it in his own country. He spoke, wrote and published upon the subject till the public interest was thoroughly aroused and the needful help appeared. One gentleman alone offered for the purpose 250 acres of land with farm-buildings thereon, or the value of the gift, as might be most convenient. In the end, the more desirable estate of Rijsselt was purchased, with its premises and about 130 acres of arable land, woods, copses and meadows, for about £2700. The principal dwelling-house was altered for the reception of the boys. Four family houses, each capable of lodging fourteen inmates with their house-father, were built by the liberality of the King, the Queen Dowager and Prince Frederic. A new school-house was added in 1851; and, a sufficient number of boys having been admitted, Mr. Schlimmer entered upon his duties as the first Director of the establishment in 1852. A great deal depends upon his management, and he is thoroughly worthy of his post. The whole Society is under the active direction of a committee who meet once a month. The rules of the Netherland Mettray have been translated into English, French and German. They have been largely circulated, and their important influence may be judged from the fact that a similar colony has been founded upon their basis in

Bavaria. The 1st article states the object of the Society to be "to receive into an agricultural colony as many indigent and neglected boys, of the Protestant religion, as the funds will permit, and to educate them for a certain period of time."* That period extends generally from their ninth to their eighteenth year. In the 29th article the Director is enjoined "to try, in every respect, to gain the confidence of his pupils, that they may consider him as their father and tutor; he must take care that God's holy name be not abused by the pupils; that lies be severely punished; that the sentence-system be applied; that the saving-cash system be introduced for the benefit of the pupils; that the pupils be accustomed to the utmost neatness as to body and dress; that the behaviour, character and inclinations of every pupil be noted in a register; that every week or fortnight a solemn meeting be held of all the pupils and persons in the service of the colony, which meeting will be opened with a prayer, and then addresses and hymns alternately, and at which the register will be consulted, and the necessary reproofs, punishments, encouragements or rewards assigned."† The standard of intellectual culture is unusually high for a charity of this kind. French, German, English, Mathematics, &c., are taught to those boys who are being prepared in the normal training-school for the work of teaching. Vocal and instrumental music are both taught in the establishment. The boys, moreover, are subjected to a complete military drill. They have a good deal of honourable *esprit de corps*, which controls their behaviour through the force of public opinion; and they shew every sign of being trustfully affectionate towards their instructors. Study is not permitted to interfere with a regular amount of hand-labour. They helped to build the new chapel given them by a few kind-hearted friends; for many of the boys are being trained as carpenters or masons. It was soon found that farming did not suit the taste and powers of every pupil. Workshops were therefore provided, in which some might learn the different trades of carpenter, mason, cabinet-maker, tailor, blacksmith, and the like. Some of the boys were raised through the grade of elder brothers to that of monitors, and even to the position of house-fathers.

* Vol. II. p. 273.

† Vol. II. p. 275.

When new family houses were built, new monitors were chosen to superintend them ; so that gradually the Monitor system took the place of the original Father system. Mr. de Liefde points out what he considers a grave defect in the Rijsselt establishment, namely, the absence of women and girls. A home is not perfect which is without a mother at its head. A few families of girls would bring the whole institution nearer to nature, and would help to mould the boys for their future duties as husbands and masters of families of their own. But a considerable outlay would be required to fill up that blank.

On the whole, the life at Rijsselt strikes us as far brighter and healthier than that either of the Rauhe Haus or the School at Beuggen. Every house has a play-ground behind it. The meals are not rendered sombre by too much religious talk. Where boys live, there ought to be nothing to encourage the precocious gravity of little saints ; there can hardly be too much liberty for youthful merriment, sport and romance. A frank recognition of what is beautiful in the instincts of boyhood, tends, we believe, to keep the heart of religion itself sound and genuine, while it conduces immensely to the happiness of those early years when happiness would seem to be not only a privilege and a right, but a business and a duty. Work, play and worship, are mingled in fair proportions at Rijsselt. The moral and religious training of the pupils is promoted by a variety of expedients, amongst which the "sentence-system" is conspicuous. Each building, from the chapel down to the kitchen, and likewise each dormitory, has been distinguished with a proverb or a scriptural text. These sentences are occasionally put into rhyme : thus the shed for garden utensils bears the couplet :

Weed ye your ground : I keep mine clear ;
Thus weeds and tares must disappear.

In the model farm is seen :

A frugal mouth and active hand
Buy other people's house and land.

Such sentences are often given to the boys to learn by heart. We like the following sample especially :

He who seeks himself will not find God.
A poor man he, who has nothing but money.

It is difficult to convey a due impression of the wise and

VOL. III. F

happy spirit in which the Colony is managed ; but much may be inferred from the subjoined outline of how the Sunday is spent.

"Sunday at Mettray is kept as a day of public devotion, rest and recreation. The forenoon is spent in the parish church. From 1 to 2, singing class ; from 2 to 4, a walk under the leading of the respective family heads ; from 4 to 5, psalms and hymns are committed to memory ; from 5 to 6, the catechist of the parish holds a Scripture-reading class at the meeting-house ; from 6 till supper, the boys are at liberty to play, to read, to amuse themselves at their pleasure."*

In passing from Beuggen to Rijsselt we have evidently entered a new theological climate. The fact is, that what we usually call Liberal Christianity has made great progress in Holland. Most of our readers, we imagine, will be disposed to rejoice at the very tendencies which Mr. de Liefde deplores in the following passage :

"I have already stated that Mr. Suringar is known as belonging to the heterodox, or, as the Dutch call it, the *liberal* party, which forms the majority of the Dutch National Church. His Mettray has not the sympathy of the orthodox. If Mr. Suringar's religious opinions were put in juxtaposition with those of Mr. Heldring, for instance, it would appear that, though both call Christ a Saviour, yet that the Christ of the one is altogether a different person from the Christ of the other. Mr. Suringar, as far as I am aware, never published a declaration of what he means by the term Saviour, as applied to Christ ; only this much is certain, that he does not understand that term in the orthodox sense. Nor is there any article in the Statutes, or in the Reports of the Colony, that throws any light upon that point. The education at the Colony is professedly religious. The character of the Dutch, as a religiously-minded and church-going nation, is fairly represented ; but the doctrinal basis upon which that religious life rests is uncertain. In fact, it has no other basis than the accidental religious opinions of the individuals who at present constitute the committee. I do not believe that the teachers at the Colony go so far as to join Strauss and Renan in rejecting everything supernatural ; but neither do they join Calvin or Luther in proclaiming Christ as God, and as our substitute on the cross. Doctrinal teaching, if I am right, is on the whole avoided ; and if such truths as the orthodox call fundamental are not inculcated, neither are they attacked."†

* Vol. II. p. 297.

† Vol. II. p. 311.

Yet Mr. de Liefde confesses that the higher element of education is not wholly neglected at the Netherland Met-tray—"the Bible being daily read, and Christ held out to be revered as a Saviour, loved as a friend, and imitated as a pattern;" only perhaps, and here is the danger, "a meaning not much higher may be attached to these words than if applied to William the Silent or to Socrates."

It will be instructive to revert at this point to the Evangelical views and method of Zeller and Bräm. In spite of our author's fears, we venture to hope more permanent good from heterodox freedom than from orthodox narrowness, even though the latter may be conjoined with a greater indulgence of fervour, quaintness and sentiment. We are utterly sceptical as to the real benefit to be derived from religious teaching like this, for example. Father Zeller divides a sermon from Rom xiii. 11—14, into three heads, each beginning with a preposition thus: *Up!* (ver. 11, Awake out of sleep); *Off!* (ver. 12, Cast off the works of darkness); *On* (verses 12 and 14, Put on the armour of light; put on the Lord Jesus Christ). "He liked to speak," we are told, "very much about the *magnalia Dei* (the glories of God), and often in his own characteristic way he would change this word into '*habalia*,' adding, *Have, have, we must have it!*" The newly-awakened reverence of his contemporaries for the natural, the spirit of criticism and inquiry affecting every department of human knowledge, the unbounded belief in Goethe and the tender loyalty to Schiller which had possessed so many thousands of his countrymen, the religious and political aspirations which ventured to dream of a better Church and State,—all these Zeller simply called "the evil spirits of our age, which go not out but by prayer and fasting." For all the perplexities of the time he had but one panacea—Biblical instruction. History was nothing but the record of Divine justice and human error, and might stir up national pride. Science could never be taught with sufficient completeness to be worth anything to the humble cottager. But the Bible could be explained to everybody, and not a chapter or verse be overlooked. Time spent on Homer, or the story of William Tell, is wasted; therefore the boys shall study the Book of Sirach. One day he smilingly held out a farthing to the children. A boy jumped up and got it. "We should," he

said, "take the Lord with as much pleasure as we take a farthing." "In summer many people go to bathing-places. We will go to the right fountain—to Jesus." And yet, when Pestalozzi visited the Beuggen establishment and saw Zeller's work, he said, "What a power! What a power! I wish I could begin my labours over again." The truth is, Zeller was far greater than his system. With so much that was superfluous in his creed, he had almost everything that was essential. With all his fanaticism, he was a Christian to the core.

Pastor Bräm is equally an adept in the same sort of religion-made-easy for simple minds. To manage your servants, you must "oil your voice and words with the oil of love," just as you would cure a creaking door-hinge. Sunday, of course, must be consecrated almost entirely to religious exercises. The rich must not use their carriages on that day, and the mechanic must not take his longer sleep on a Sunday morning, or give way to drowsiness in church. There must be no little bit of house-work or clothes-mending done by the wife. "And the railways! and the steam-boats! and the post! . . . May the time not be far off when the power of the Gospel will also master these mighty departments, and control, organize and bless them with its sweet, gentle rod!" The power of prayer is a force susceptible of universal application; bearing in mind that if the prayer of *one* has failed, the combined "wrestling" of *two*, or, at any rate, *three*, is almost sure to prevail. Of which a notable instance is given, amongst many, as it was related by the master of a family in regard to a very refractory child. "The usual means for improving the child, viz., kindness first, then severity, proved fruitless. Even prayer seemed to have no effect. We had actually resolved to return the child to the Society as incorrigible. Suddenly the thought occurred to me that the *united prayers of two or three* might be tried. I requested the parson and the school-master of our village to remember the child especially in their prayers, and at the same time to keep a watchful eye upon it. The Lord has blessed that way. Up to this time the child has given us no reason for complaint."* These triumphs over the Divine reluctance may be very gratifying

* Vol. II. p. 129.

to Pastor Bräm, but we would rather join Mr. Suringar and other suspected heretics in their simpler and more mundane wrestlings with sin, ignorance, bad breeding, bad example, and the like.

Testing the Mettray system by its fruits, we are glad to notice that among a hundred boys, who from the foundation of the Colony till May, 1861, had returned to society, there were only ten who gave reason of complaint; and of these there were only four whose conduct was decidedly bad. It will be remembered that the proportion of known failures at Beuggen was stated to be 10 per cent., only 70 per cent. turning out well. Comparing the two institutions with each other, we should be inclined to say that the standard of general human culture is too low at Beuggen and too high at Rijsselt. There is some ground for the fear expressed by Mr. de Liefde, that the really *high* education given to the objects of the latter charity may look like a premium upon negligence and dissipation. If the drunkard's son gains so much by his father's folly, it seems to bear rather hard upon the son of the poor, industrious labourer, who is apparently disqualified by his father's virtues from being helped forward in so splendid a fashion. As it is, the institution costs the Society each year about £15 a pupil. If the cost could be lowered, a very fair education might be given to a much larger number, and the original object of the founders be better secured, which was to thin the pauper population of the towns, and to increase the class of healthy, contented country people. At the Neuhoef Asylum, near Strasburg, the support of a child averages between £9 and £10. At the Dinglingen Asylum, in Baden, a child cost £8. 6s. 8d. during 1862. If it were not for the large voluntary contributions of about £1192 a year, the Netherland Mettray could not meet its expenses. The total income at the close of 1862 amounted to £2396, and the total expenditure to £2274. The praiseworthy economy of the Dutch philanthropists will not allow them on any plea to run into debt. If any new plan is proposed, the money for it must be collected before the expense may be incurred. They do not consider it quite straightforward philanthropy, first to start schemes and then to importune Providence to pay their debts. And we think that, on the whole, the heterodox Netherlanders are right.

Mr. Bost is well known in England and Scotland as the

founder and conductor of five establishments at Laforce (Dordogne), into which he receives orphan girls, young girls who are in any way exposed to moral peril, girls who are in danger of being brought up Roman Catholics, girls who are infirm, or incurable, or blind, or idiots, or lunatic, or epileptic, and orphan or poor boys of the same unhappy classes. Mr. Bost is quite of opinion that insane and epileptic patients stand in special need of country air and all the cheering sights and sounds of unspoiled nature. The story of the rapid growth of this important charity reads like a romance; and one is tempted to forgive all the imprudence for the sake of the quick compassion which induced this true friend of the unfortunate to build one house after another on the sole security of providential assistance. He *has* been helped, beyond a doubt, most copiously. For no sooner did his undertaking become known, than the public learnt their own duty from his zeal, and liberally supported him. A plain, unvarnished report of what takes place within these hospitable walls could not but awaken the strongest sympathy and admiration. No one can read without emotion such a picture as the following from Mr. de Liefde's pen:

"In each of the rooms the same touching sight presented itself, viz., the continuous and sometimes apparently hopeless struggle of patient charity to untwist the strings of imbecility with which the minds of those poor creatures were tied down. I do not believe that there is a place in the world where the patience and perseverance of love is put to a stronger test than in a school of idiots. . . . Only fancy yourself sitting down beside a child with no other object during a whole hour than to make it pronounce and write an *o*! and, when you have got through that hour, you find that the figure the child scribbles down resembles as much an *o* as a pair of tongs resembles an egg. Or imagine yourself engaged for another hour in trying to teach a girl of ten or twelve years to shift a little piece of wood from the left to the right side of another piece, and at the close of the hour, during which you have corrected her a couple of hundred times, you find that she fancies she is doing exactly what you want her to do by laying one piece across the other! Indeed, such work would, in the long run, make you an idiot also, if love did not continually refresh your consciousness of being engaged in a most useful labour."*

* Vol. II. p. 436.

Or this, which shews how much heart there may be left in an idiot when the light of intellect has been nearly quenched :

"One day a poor girl, an object of the deepest commiseration, deaf, dumb, blind, paralytic and epileptic, was brought to Bethesda. It required some courage to keep one's eyes fixed on the miserable creature, with her dried-up, contracted limbs, her repulsive face, the features of which were constantly contorted in the most hideous way. Well, an idiot took charge of that child, guarded and nursed it, and stood by its deathbed to administer to it the last solace of love."*

It was with some curiosity that we looked to see how the religious training of the idiots is managed. We have often wondered how an orthodox believer explains the idiot's assurance or hope of salvation. We presume it cannot be laid at their door as a personal sin that they are utterly incapable of even comprehending the received doctrine of Christ's vicarious sacrifice. How can they *believe* unto salvation a doctrine of which they have *no conception*? But if they *are* loved all the same by their Heavenly Father, and *are* gathered at the end of their sad pilgrimage into His bosom, it will not be by virtue of the truth of their creed, but the dim, confiding love of a tender heart, which no grotesqueness or *bizarrie* of opinions, or total absence of opinions, could destroy. We cannot glean from our author's statements how this logical difficulty is met, but the following remarks are the common-sense solution of the matter :

"I do not wonder at such hearts being able to understand what is the meaning of the sentence, 'God loveth you,' long before the intellect is able to catch the difference between two and three. Nor can I be surprised at what Mrs. Castel told me,—that the same children who do not know whether a shoe ought to be on the foot or on the head, or who, if not prevented, would, like animals, walk on all fours, and lick the dirt, may yet sometimes be heard ejaculating, '*Mon Dieu! Prends pitié de moi! J'en ai bien besoin!*'"†

It is pleasant to be able to add that the establishments of Laforce are, "to a considerable extent, monuments of the charity of Christian friends in Great Britain."

* Vol. II. p. 450.

† Ibid.

We sincerely regret that it was beyond the scope of Mr. de Liefde's purpose to visit and describe any of the Roman Catholic Charities of the continent. Popery unfortunately is regarded by him flatly as a false religion, and therefore its influence cannot be of a wholesome or redeeming nature. Yet every one knows that active charity has always been a distinguishing virtue of the Roman Catholic community, and we could have wished that some notice had been taken of the philanthropic institutions of the oldest Church in Christendom. Why, again, are the Charitable Establishments connected with other religious bodies, or with no religious body, entirely passed over in a work which bears so comprehensive a title as "*The Charities of Europe*"? However, we can hardly complain of an author whose selection was guided by honourable sympathies, and who has actually done so much, and done it so well. We assure the reader that our imperfect specimen of the work excites no promise which will not be more than fulfilled by the sustained interest of Mr. de Liefde's own comments and descriptions. The best proof of the power of his narrative is that it suffers considerably by any abridgment. A word or two on another point must bring our survey of a very wide subject to a close.

"Charity," it is said, "covers a multitude of sins." It may well, therefore, be allowed to fling a graceful veil over a few theological eccentricities and, as we honestly think them, educational mistakes. The present volumes introduce us to a number of hard-working philanthropists, mainly of the Evangelical type. If we have dared to question the value of some portion of their method on such insufficient data as a book affords, we have done so with profound respect for their labours as a whole. They may have a contracted estimate of the manifold claims of human nature and human life, the hundredfold necessities of the wide world. But what they want of breadth of view is more than made up by depth and intensity of character, which is perhaps a more precious thing. Their odd notions about the natural and the supernatural, rationalism and infidelity, and all the rest of it, may afford a kind of thoughtful amusement to the observer. But when every drawback of the sort has been made, there still remains an indestructible result which is absolutely above either his smile or his pity,

which indeed commands his unconditional veneration. Beneath all their words and actions, though they do seem to harp too much upon one string, he catches an unmistakable undertone of downright earnest, where the human is lost in the divine; a certain genuine childlike piety, blending harmoniously with the purest self-sacrificing love, and issuing spontaneously in life-long labours for the sinful and the sorrowing and the outcast. Surely this love to God and love to man is the very Religion which cannot pass away. So long as the Christian Church by her devoutness of worship and beneficence of work chooses to take her stand on this rock, she may be attacked on all sides, but she will never be undermined. Against *this* rock there is nothing in the universe which can possibly prevail.

EDWIN SMITH.

IV.—HISTORY OF THE JEWISH CHURCH.

Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part II.

From Samuel to the Captivity. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D. London: Murray. 1865.

Geschichte des Volkes Israel. Von Heinrich Ewald. Dritter Band. (Third Volume of Ewald's History of Israel.) 1853.

THE history of the Israelites is, strictly speaking, the history of the Church. No one can understand thoroughly the Christian Church who looks upon it as an isolated phenomenon, unaffected by any reaction from the world in which it arose, and unconnected by any fine threads of spiritual influence and transmitted thought with the times which preceded its origin. And in the same way, it would be impossible to understand the history of Israel, or appreciate its meaning and importance for the world, were it to be studied otherwise than in its relation to those better things for which it prepared the way. That little nation, which for so many centuries occupied the triangular strip of territory that extends from Lebanon southwards along the Mediterranean coast, unpractised as it was in the arts

of empire, without science, without philosophy, without political knowledge, without art, without commerce,—a prey and a spoil to the surrounding peoples,—having within itself the seeds of apparently hopeless corruption, and yet ever, by some strange toughness of fibre, recovering its vitality,—would have comparatively small interest for us were we to study its history apart from its connection with the spiritual life of our own time. But to that nation was committed the care of the True Religion—the religion that there is One holy and righteous God, that mercy is better than sacrifice, that the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit and a contrite heart, and that to fear God and keep His commandments is the whole duty of man. To this religion all that was best and truest in the nation remained constant. There were times when the worship of Jehovah was all but extinguished; there were times when the witnesses for the living God were few and despised, outcast and persecuted. But there were always a few to raise their voices for the truth and protest against the sins of kings and people. The true religion might be disowned at Jerusalem; it might be compelled to share the honours of the temple itself with Baal and Ashtaroah; the idolatry of the surrounding nations, and the licentiousness which that idolatry consecrated, might seem to have gained a final victory. But the religion of the One God always found a home in some faithful hearts, and was never without some prophetic voice uplifted on its behalf. Prosperity, which seemed its most dangerous foe, could not utterly corrupt it. The most overwhelming calamities failed to destroy it. The Church, however down-trodden and oppressed, never ceased to exist and struggle for its rights. If the present seemed hopeless, it all the more threw itself upon the future, and out of its darkest fortunes rose up those bright visions of universal happiness and peace—visions of a time when Jehovah should reign over all the earth without a rival, and all the nations look for salvation to Jerusalem—with which the best hopes of mankind have ever since been bound up. The Jewish Church fought the same battle with the kings of the surrounding nations and with the degenerate descendants of David, as the Christian Church eventually fought upon a wider field and with an intenser consciousness of the grandeur of its mission. And it is this fact which gives to the

history of the Israelites its transcendent interest for mankind.

There was, however, one brief period during which it might have seemed probable that Israel would have exchanged this special interest for one of a more general kind. Shortly after the consolidation of the people under one ruler, it seemed as though she would step forward into the great family of nations, perhaps to take her place at the head of them all, as at once the greatest military and maritime power of the world. The Philistines, in early times the most obstinate and most dreaded enemy of the Israelites, were partially subdued by Saul. Their conquest was completed by David. By this warlike monarch, who began his reign at Hebron, the important fortress of Jebus was captured, and under the name of Jerusalem was made the capital of his kingdom. No enemy being left between the Jordan and the Mediterranean, his arms were next turned against the Moabites to the east of the Dead Sea. The tide of conquest then rolled northwards, advancing almost to the walls of the hitherto unknown Nineveh. The Syrians, the Ammonites and the Edomites, all passed under the sceptre of David. Fortresses were planted upon the Euphrates; and when Solomon ascended the throne of his father, he found himself at the head of a great empire embracing many different nations, and many large and populous cities, within its limits. No danger from without threatened his prosperity; and if there was any internal disaffection, it was vigorously and completely subdued. He was on friendly terms with the great powers of the world, and in the closest alliance with Egypt and with Tyre. Now was the time to cultivate the arts of peace, and now they were cultivated as never again in Palestine. During the reign of this peaceful monarch, the temple for which his father David had made such vast preparations arose in silent magnificence upon the heights of Moriah—that temple which was itself less a testimony to the religiousness of king Solomon than an illustration of his power and the extent of his kingdom, embracing as it did—as Dean Stanley has well pointed out—the characteristics of four different styles of architecture—the Phœnician,* the Assyrian, the

* “Whenever in coins or histories we get a representation of a Phœnician temple, it always has a pillar or pillars standing before or within it. Such in

Egyptian, and the Semitic ;—that temple into which were carried in solemn state the two tables of the Covenant, which, if they had been consulted, would have sternly prohibited some at least of the characteristic features of the shrine upon Moriah. It is indeed a curious proof to what an extent the Mosaic law was in abeyance at this time—at least in its strict letter—that not only were there graven images in the Holy of Holies, but on the lid of the Ark itself. There were, moreover, steps up to the altar, contrary to the express prohibition of the law, while the whole powers of the priesthood seemed to be superseded in the person of the king. But no doubt it would be easy to find examples of the letter of a received rule continuing to be held in outward reverence long after its observance has become either distasteful or impossible.

Of the domestic life of Palestine during this period we do not know much, except that it must have been a time of unexampled prosperity for the entire nation. But it was perhaps the trade with foreign nations which grew up during Solomon's reign that more than anything else gave promise of enduring dominion. Had the Israelites been themselves apt for a maritime life, instead of being dependent for their supply of sailors upon their Phœnician neighbours, the glory of Solomon might have gone down to his successors, and a very different set of associations might have been connected with the Hebrew name. No country could be better situated than Palestine either for commerce or for the formation of a universal empire ; and if these things were determined by geographical position, the Jews, and not the Romans, must have been the masters of the world. Having as its western boundary the long line of the Mediterranean coast, and with its southern frontier pushed forward to the gulf of Akaba, the eastern arm of the Red Sea, Palestine commanded the three continents of the old world, and her ships might have carried to her shores—as for a short time it seems that they did—the riches of them all. A com-

Solomon's temple were Jachin and Boaz." (*Lectures on the Jewish Church*, Second Series, p. 206.) Is not Dean Stanley wrong, however, in placing these pillars, as he does (p. 211), within the porch ? The Hebrew preposition here employed signifies, when used of place, "to," "into," or "at ;" see 1 Kings vii. 21, and note the change of preposition in Jer. lii. 17. See also the plan of Solomon's temple in Kiepert's *Bibel-Atlas*. Dean Stanley, however, has the support of Ewald.

mercial navy was now built, manned with Tyrian sailors, through the favour of king Hiram. Ships sailed from Ezion-geber, the port built by Solomon at the head of the Red Sea, southwards and eastwards to India, and returned bringing aloes, cassia and cinnamon, sandal-wood and peacocks. And other ships sailed from the western ports—it is remarkable, however, that none is mentioned except Tyre itself—westwards as far as Spain, and came back laden with gold and silver and ivory. It is true the peacocks—an Indian bird—are noticed in connection with the latter, and not with the former; but whatever may be the explanation of this apparent error, we shall scarcely adopt the suggestion of Dean Stanley—of course he intends it as no more than a bare possibility, which undoubtedly would remove the difficulty—that the merchant vessels of Solomon may have circumnavigated the continent of Africa, taking in “abundance of silver” from Spain on their outward voyage, and picking up the peacocks on their homeward journey, the whole round being completed in three years.* Of the effects, however, of this wide commercial activity there can be no doubt. Both east and west contributed to the splendour of king Solomon and to the glory of Jerusalem. The luxuries, and still more the licentiousness, of a semi-heathen court, corrupted the heart of the nobles. Solomon, we are told, made no bondmen of the children of Israel; but those who were left of the original inhabitants of the land, and who, notwithstanding the wars of extermination waged by the Israelites, must have formed a considerable proportion of the whole population, were enslaved, and no doubt were employed in those immense works of building and fortification which made the reign of Solomon so famous.† Dean Stanley notices particularly the effect of this maritime enterprize upon the imagination and literature of the people.

“We know not when the Psalms were written which contain the allusions to the wonders of the sea, and which by these have become endeared to a maritime empire like our own; but, if not composed in the reign of Solomon, at least they are derived from the stimulus which he gave to nautical discovery. The 104th Psalm seems almost as if it had been written by one of the super-

* 1 Kings x. 22.

† See 1 Kings ix. 20—23.

intendents of the deportations of timber from the heights of Lebanon. The mountains, the springs, the cedars, the sea in the distance, with its ships and monster brood, are combined in that landscape as nowhere else. The 107th describes, with the feeling of one who had been at sea himself, the sensations of those who went down from the hills of Judah to the ships of Jaffa, and to their business in the great waters of the Mediterranean; the sudden storm, the rising to the crest of the waves as if to meet the heavens, and then sinking down as if into the depths of the grave; the staggering to and fro on deck, the giddiness and loss of thought and sense; and to this, in the Book of Proverbs, is added a notice rare in any ancient writings, unique in the Hebrew Scriptures, of the well-known signs of sea-sickness; where the drunkard is warned that if he tarries long at the wine, he shall be reduced to the wretched state of 'him that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth down before the rudder.'*

"Imagine, too, the arrival of those strange plants and animals, enlivening the monotony of Israelitish life; the brilliant metals, the fragrant woods, the gorgeous peacock, the chattering ape—to that inland people, rare as the first products of America to the inhabitants of Europe. Observe the glimpse given to us, into those remote regions, here seen for an instant. Now for the first time Europe was open to the view of the chosen people—Spain, the Peru of the old world, Spain, Tartessus, Cadiz (the '*Kadesh*,' the western sanctuary of the Phœnician people), the old historic Straits—the vast Atlantic beyond—possibly our own islands, our own Cornish coasts, which had already sent the produce of their mines into the heart of Asia,—were seen by the eyes of Israelites."†

Such was the glory of Solomon's reign; but that glory was destined to pass away, leaving, however, its traces behind, in the visions of peace and prosperity which entered so largely into the Messianic idea, and in the expectation of a return of that age when the kings of the earth were governed from Jerusalem. The causes which led to the dissolution of the empire, and the separation of the ten tribes, were of two kinds, political and religious. On the one hand, notwithstanding the statement already noticed that Solomon made no bondmen of the children of Israel, there can be no doubt that the cost of the palace and the temple must have necessitated a system of oppressive taxation. The splendour

* Prov. xxiii. 30, 34.

† Pp. 185—187.

of the court could not have been sustained, had not heavy burdens been imposed upon the people. The complaint of the Israelites and of their leader Jeroboam to the heir of the kingdom, was, "Thy father made our yoke grievous," and the condition on which they promised obedience was not unreasonable—"Now therefore make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his yoke which he put upon us, lighter, and we will serve thee."* Besides, it may perhaps be questioned how far there had been any consciousness of national unity among the tribes of Israel prior to the time of Solomon. Under the judges, it is clear that the tribes were very loosely bound together. The times of Saul and David were too troubled to admit of the growth of any sentiment requiring the influences of peaceful intercourse and commerce for its development, and when Solomon ascended the throne, the royal house was still of too recent origin to have created any abiding sense of loyalty. And if in the beginning of his reign a revolt seemed not impossible, it is no wonder that, when he was succeeded by a weak and inexperienced prince, the disaffection which had been hitherto restrained by a strong hand broke out into open rebellion.

But, upon the other hand, whatever may have been the force of the political motive, there seems reason to believe that this great movement was undertaken, partly at least, from a religious impulse, and carried out under the direction of the prophets of Jehovah as a protest against the idolatry which had disgraced the latter portion of the reign of Solomon. This statement, we are aware, may seem somewhat startling, especially when it is remembered that one of the first acts of Jeroboam on the establishment of his kingdom was to inaugurate the worship of two calves of gold, which he set up at Bethel and Dan in order to deter his subjects from going up to Jerusalem, and that he himself is so constantly spoken of as "Jeroboam the son of Nebat who made Israel to sin." The truth is, however, that the scriptural narrative combines two different views not entirely consistent with one another. The difficulty presented by the golden calves we shall presently examine. Meantime, as we have already contemplated the reign of Solomon in its

* 1 Kings xii. 4.

material splendour, it may be well to trace rapidly the history of religion from the time of Saul, and to follow up those subtle causes which combined with the more obvious political ones to bring about the division of the kingdom.

The True Religion—the worship of Jehovah—was the sacred charge of the people of Israel, and the people in this respect were represented by the prophets. The voice of the prophets was the voice of Jehovah, but it was also, in the best sense, the *vox populi*—i.e. it expressed the truest instincts and the highest aspirations of the people. Prior to Samuel, there seems to have been no distinct order of prophets, and notwithstanding the antiquity popularly attributed to the Pentateuch, it must be considered more than doubtful whether there was any thorough organization of priests and levites. The judge seems to have combined in himself the functions of prophet, priest and king; and it was only by degrees that these offices were assigned to different persons. Moses, the leader of the Hebrews, was regarded by after ages as the greatest of the prophets. Of Othniel, who “judged Israel and went out to war,” we read, that “the Spirit of the Lord came upon him.” Gideon offered sacrifice to Jehovah, after he had destroyed the altar of Baal. Deborah is expressly stated to have been both prophetess and judge. Eli was judge and priest; and if there was a regular priesthood in the time of Samuel, Samuel himself offered sacrifice, and was also a prophet and a judge. Towards the end of Samuel’s life, however, a new power rises up, occupying a position, certainly to some extent, hostile to that of the prophets. Samuel, so far as we are informed, was not himself possessed of military capacity; and hence, in the press of danger from without,—the Philistines threatening upon one hand, the Ammonites upon the other,—it became necessary to appoint some chief who could lead the army to battle. The people, too, were no longer disposed to be content with leaders raised up to meet particular emergencies. They demanded a king. The result was the appointment of Saul, and the consequent separation of the military and judicial from the prophetic or spiritual office.

Whether the appointment of a king was really opposed to the strongly-expressed counsels of Samuel, as one portion of the original narrative represents, is a question upon which

Dean Stanley does not attempt to throw any light. From his passing over this part of the story in silence, it may perhaps be inferred that he adopts the opinion of Ewald, that the gloomy picture of the evils of monarchy put in the mouth of Samuel is from the pen of a comparatively late writer of the prophetic school. That the picture was drawn after, and not before, experience of the reality is evident enough. But probably the truth is, that Samuel in consenting to the elevation of Saul only yielded to the necessities of the case, and parted reluctantly with any portion of his own power. His sons were incapable of filling his place worthily. There was no one among the sons of the prophets endowed with military qualities. It was necessary, therefore, to look out for some one among the people possessed of great physical prowess, and in choosing Saul, Samuel no doubt hoped that he would remain an instrument in his own hands for carrying out his purposes. But whether or not this be the right construction to put upon the narrative, it is clear that there was no lasting peace between the king and the prophet. Saul soon became dissatisfied with the restraint attempted to be put upon his action, and determined to be king indeed. It is very difficult for those who view the old records in the light of modern times to pass any severe censure upon Saul for his two acts of disobedience. The one was simply the assertion of his right to the priestly power—a right which, according to all precedent, he really possessed, and certainly as much as Samuel himself. The other, though its motive may have been bad, looks to us more like an act of mercy than a crime. Of the former, Dean Stanley can only somewhat mistily say, after admitting that “as king he had the right to sacrifice”—

“He sacrificed, and by that ritual zeal defied the warning of the Prophetic monitor. It was the crisis of his trial. He had shewn that he could not understand the distinction between moral and ceremonial duty, on which the greatness of his people depended. [But the difficulty is to see how moral duty was concerned at all.] It was not because he sacrificed, but because he thought sacrifice greater than obedience, that the curse descended upon him.”*

* P. 22.

In regard to the other case, however, Dean Stanley is no doubt right in saying that Saul spared king Agag for no other reason than "to make a more splendid show at the sacrificial thanksgiving." Judged by the standard of that rude age, and in view of its motives, the act may have deserved the indignant reprobation it received.

The separation between Samuel and Saul was now complete. The fiercest spiritual thunders of that age had been hurled against the head of the latter, and it is no wonder that a religious melancholy settled down upon his superstitious mind. To what extent Saul subsequently proved faithless to the worship of Jehovah, and set a bad example to his successors of practising heathen rites, there is little evidence to enable us to determine; but the names of his sons—Jonathan or "the gift of Jehovah," Melchi-shua or "the help of Moloch," and Ish-baal or "the man of Baal"—have been pointed out as indicating his desertion of Jehovah for the gods of the Phœnicians and the Ammonites.* And from this time forth the breach thus begun between the prophetic order and the kings continued with few exceptions till the overthrow of the monarchy. It was inevitable. The inspiration of God has no preference for crowned heads, and is not favoured by the atmosphere of a court. The prophets, as has been said, were a popular order, and they were now thrown upon the people more completely than ever. The ritual worship was eventually brought over to support the power of the kings; but upon the other side were arrayed those uncompromising advocates of the religion of the heart, those determined opponents, as they often became, of mere ritual worship—the Prophets—and the faithful few among the people who had never bowed the knee to Baal.

David was, of course, the one grand exception to this rule. David, "the man after God's own heart," as he really was in the sense intended—namely, of having never been guilty of the sin of idolatry—David, who had been raised

* The statement of Mr. Newman (*Hebrew Monarchy*, p. 52), that "in the beginning of his reign Saul had acted the part of a zealous Jehovist," seems nearer the truth than Dean Stanley's, that "backwards and forwards in the names of his children, we see alternately the signs of the old heathenish superstition, and of the now purified religion of JEHOVAH"—which is not consistent with his own text.

up from among the sheepfolds of Israel to be the shepherd of the Lord's people, was not only in every respect a king, but he was essentially a prophet as well. It would seem that Samuel, having been disappointed in his expectations of Saul, had discovered in the youthful warrior who slew the Philistine giant, in the bard who charmed away the melancholy of his king with the sweet strains of his harp, the true heir to the throne. David by his martial prowess and his kingly qualities drew the hearts of the people after him. He was even more than Saul the sovereign of the people; he was the choice of the prophetic order. And all through his long and brilliant reign his heart remained true to the promise of his youth, and faithful to that God whose hand he recognized in his elevation to the throne and in every event of his life. If he sinned against the moral law, as he did most grievously "in the matter of Uriah the Hittite," his conscience was never so steeled against the sharp incisions of prophetic reproof as to make him capable of seeking refuge in any of those idolatrous rites which would have sanctioned his crime. He bowed at once before Nathan's, "*Thou art the man,*" and poured out his soul in those penitential strains which in their depth and fervour have never been surpassed. It is true that David is not anywhere called a prophet; but it is equally true that if the aged Samuel could have lived to see him king, he would never have repented his choice, nor have found cause to raise his voice against him as he had raised it against Saul.

It may have been because David himself was so true a worshiper of Jehovah, because he himself partook so largely of the prophetic character, that the prophets during his reign played no important part. It was probably because the reign of Solomon was a time of unexampled prosperity, and during the earlier part of it characterized by steadfast adherence to the true worship, that no great prophets then arose. According to Dean Stanley,

"The one institution of the Jewish commonwealth which received no visible growth or encouragement during Solomon's reign, was the Prophetical order. Of Nathan, his Prophet-teacher, we hear nothing after his inauguration, except that the Prophet's two sons, Azariah and Zabud, held, as we have seen, distinguished offices in the court, and that Solomon's reign was partially recorded by Nathan. The only Prophet who takes an

active part, and that quite in the close of the reign, is Ahijah of Shiloh. It is not clear whether it was through his mouth in the first instance, or through a dream, as in the earlier periods of Solomon's life, that the Divine intimation was conveyed, announcing the disruption of his kingdom and the fall of his house. But in either case, it was a significant token of the approaching calamity, that the Prophet once more, as in the time of Saul, stood opposed to the King."*

As to the means by which the Divine intimation was conveyed, it is quite clear that the narrative expressly mentions a dream; but there can of course be no objection to Dean Stanley's preferring a rationalistic explanation. The important fact, however, is the appearance of Ahijah in conjunction with Jeroboam. To him the prophet announces the dissolution of the kingdom and the downfall of the house of Solomon. To him he states the cause of this catastrophe as lying in the fact that "they have worshiped Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, Chemosh the god of the Moabites, and Milcom the god of the children of Ammon, and have not walked in my ways to do that which is right in mine eyes, and to keep my statutes and my judgments as did David his father." To him, finally, he announces the promise of the Lord, that "if thou wilt hearken unto all that I command thee, and wilt walk in my ways, and do that which is right in my sight, and keep my statutes and commandments as David my servant did, I will be with thee, and build thee a sure house, as I built for David, and will give Israel unto thee."† It would appear, therefore, that the revolt of the ten tribes took place at the instigation and under the direction of the prophetic order. "The original idea of the disruption was that it was a Divine dispensation. 'The thing was from the Lord.' It was as much part of the Divine economy of the national destinies as the erection of the monarchy itself, or as the substitution of the House of David for the House of Saul."‡ It was the return of the people to the Lord their God, and a reaction of the better spirit of the nation against the idolatries of king Solomon.

It is in accordance with this view of the revolt of the tribes, that Ewald, whom Dean Stanley follows, puts the

* Pp. 262, 253.

† 1 Kings xi. 30—40.

‡ Stanley, p. 265.

following interpretation upon the story of the golden calves. Jeroboam, we learn from the scriptural narrative, had fled into Egypt to avoid a charge of treason, and had remained there until Solomon's death. There he must have seen the Divine Being represented under different animal forms, and especially under the form of the ox. Probably also Jeroboam remembered that, previous to the establishment of that monarchy which he presumed to rival, Israel had been accustomed to the use of graven images in the worship of Jehovah, and it may have seemed to him that in this respect he was simply returning to the customs of his ancestors. It may be, then, that the calves were set up at Bethel and Dan in obedience to no hankering after foreign rites or foreign divinities. "The Golden Image"—again to use Dean Stanley's words—"was doubtless intended as a likeness of the One True God." The address which is said to have hailed the inauguration of the idols—"Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt"—according to Ewald, "contains in its polytheistic turn only the view of the narrator that idolatry is nearly related to polytheism."* It is true that, according to the narrative, the new places of worship were established purely from a political necessity, lest the people should return to their allegiance to the house of David; but this also may be simply the representation of the historian. If, at least, the view of Ewald be correct, must we not ascribe to Jeroboam a nobler motive than the mere political one, for wishing that his subjects should not go up to Jerusalem—the fear lest their hearts should be drawn away by the false gods whose shrines crowned the summits of Olivet? Nevertheless, "the sin of Jeroboam wherewith he made Israel to sin" is not to be thus excused. However faithful his own heart may have been to Jehovah as the Only God, the countenance which he lent to idolatry was a concession to the sensuous tendencies of his age, to its love of outward show, which was a grievous outrage upon the true religion—the worship of God in *spirit*. There may have been a time when Israel could have worshiped God under some typical

* See 1 Kings xii. 28. The Hebrew will not bear the alteration of Dean Stanley from the plural to the singular—"Behold thy God, Israel," &c., though that may have been the original form.

form innocently. But that time had passed away. The consecration of the golden calves only prepared the way for a descent into even worse idolatry than that of Judah. Its immediate effect was the alienation from Jeroboam of the prophetic order. The king's act seems to have been unsanctioned by the prophets Ahijah and Shemaiah; and thus there took place in the northern kingdom also the same breach between the kings and the prophets, between the worldly power and the true Israel, as had already occurred in Judah. And that breach was never healed. The Church continued to be oppressed and persecuted, and to live and grow in spite of oppression and persecution, until the destruction of both kingdoms.

We must not, of course, attempt to follow Dean Stanley through all the steps of this sad history, nor will it be possible to re-produce here all or any of the brilliant pictures in which he has made the scenes of that history live again, and endowed its personages with so fresh and vivid an interest. A few words, however, of more direct criticism may reasonably be expected before the conclusion of this article.

Dean Stanley's special qualifications for the task he has undertaken are far too well known to require to be enlarged on here. Learning, thorough sympathy with his subject, a noble breadth of view, great descriptive power, an acquaintance with history so wide as to enable him to draw his illustrations from almost every period, the combined reverence and freedom with which he handles his materials, are the more conspicuous merits of the present, as they were also of the former volume on the Jewish Church. Nor can it be said that there is any striking deficiency of critical power, or any undue hesitation about treating the "sacred" books as simply historical records. There is not, indeed, the same thorough sifting of the materials, the same wonderful analysis of the old documents, as we find in Ewald; there is not that prompt reference of each portion of the narrative to its proper author, which, whether it be fully accepted or not, must assuredly be considered a most astonishing example of critical *clairvoyance*; nor could this, which is the fitting task of the historian, be expected of the lecturer. But it is gratifying to observe that Dean Stanley is so fully awake to the just demands of an impartial criticism

of Scripture, as to recognize the variations and inconsistencies of the history, to refer Ecclesiastes to a later age than Solomon's, to compare the authorship of Daniel to that of Alexander Selkirk, and to acknowledge the critically certain distinction between the earlier and later Isaiah. It may be thought a poor compliment to Dean Stanley to say that he has not entered upon so important a work without knowing something of the elements of Biblical criticism; but it is only right to give to that knowledge, and to the disposition to apply it with candour and thoroughness, the credit which is due to its rarity.

It would be pleasant to be able to leave these remarks absolutely without qualification. When, however, we descend to particulars, it must be confessed there are times when the usual transparent style gives way to a certain haziness of expression in which the events recorded look dim and unsteady. One instance of this has already passed under our notice. But it is particularly where a supernatural event comes in the way that the reader has to complain of something of the same reticence which in the former volume, after having informed him that the Israelites were on the other side of the Red Sea, left him quite uncertain how they had come there. Is it too much to have expected that a lecturer on Jewish history would have attempted some estimate of the degree of credibility to be attached to miracles, the record of which is so uncertain, and *some* of which at least are so completely at variance with the Christian idea of God? It will scarcely be said so; yet there is nothing of this. But wherever a miracle is introduced, there is always some qualifying clause, some turn of expression (marks of quotation, if nothing else) which has the effect of being introduced to avoid the responsibility of either affirmation or denial. *This, we say, is the effect.* It may not be intended. There is space at our disposal for only one example. The fine Lecture on Elijah contains, as a matter of course, some remarks on the prophet's visit to the widow of Zarephath, justly and beautifully comparing it with the subsequent visit to the same region of One greater than Elijah. Now the resurrection of the widow's son is intimated, if it be intimated at all, in these words: "She saved in him the deliverer of herself and her son;" and the

lesson of the whole story is drawn out in the following striking passage :

"The horrors of famine, the shadow of the deathbed, are the Divine conciliators of the deadliest feuds. In the history of the Church, no less than of the individual soul, man's necessity is God's opportunity for healing the widest differences. These reconcilements may be but for the moment, the iron grasp which has been forced open by those sudden efforts, closes again. Yet the grasp becomes less tenacious. The end of the golden wedge has made itself felt. It was a true feeling of the Jewish Church, if it were not a true tradition, which saw in the restoration of the widow's son to life a pledge of the future that was to arise out of this double act of toleration."*

It is a pity to blow any cold breath of criticism on the fine polish of these words. Yet the question must be asked—and it may be asked of every similar passage—will not both those who love the old narrative so well that they will not part with a single word, and will accept of nothing less, and those who feel that there is here and everywhere a spirit deeper than the letter, equally complain that they have been in some measure unfairly dealt with? Dean Stanley speaks, indeed, of the "restoration of the widow's son to life." Does he mean the *fact* of the restoration, or simply the narrative which records it? For obviously the moral which he so finely draws would remain unimpaired, although the only truth at the foundation of the story were that Elijah had been hospitably dealt with by a heathen woman in his own and her extremity.

It would be invidious to conclude with an implied censure. Let it be added, then, that, if it be fair to single out one where all are deserving of praise, the Lecture on Elijah may be regarded as the masterpiece of the present volume. And yet to say this, is unjust to the rest. There is everywhere a balance of style, a power of rising to the height of a great argument, a thorough mastery over the subject, which will give these Lectures a high place in the literature of the present age.

ROBERT B. DRUMMOND.

V.—EDWARD IRVING.

The Collected Writings of Edward Irving. Five Vols. London: Strahan. 1865.

Life of Edward Irving. Fourth Edition. One Vol. London: Hurst and Blackett.

CATHOLIC theologians of more than one school are desirous of pressing on all men the conclusion that a frank acceptance of the spirit of Protestantism, combined with powers of correct reasoning, necessitates the entire negation of dogma, and with this the abandonment of religion. Dr. Newman writes thus in his *Apologia*: "From the age of fifteen, dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion: I know no other religion; I cannot enter into the idea of any other sort of religion; religion as a mere sentiment is to me a dream and a mockery. As well can there be filial love without the fact of a father, as devotion without the fact of a Supreme Being."^{*} And he goes on to say: "Such," i.e. the principle of dogma, "was the fundamental principle of the movement of 1833."[†] Again, far more strongly: "I came to the conclusion that there was no medium in true philosophy between Atheism and Catholicity, and that a perfectly consistent mind under those circumstances in which it finds itself here below must embrace either the one or the other. And I hold this still: I am a Catholic by virtue of my believing in a God."[‡] With nearly the same meaning, the "Church Times," the organ of the extreme Catholic party within the Church of England, says, in a recent number, "We have always felt that the only consistent Protestants amongst us here in England, are those who are represented by Bishop Colenso and the writers of the *Essays and Reviews*."[§] In these assertions there is undoubtedly an admixture of truth, but the choice does not really lie between the dark and bottomless pit of Atheism, which after all is dogma, and the firm ground of belief in a God, out of which grows the grand tree of Catholicity. Faith in a God is held by all sane men, very much for Dr. Newman's reasons. "If I am asked why I believe in a

* *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, p. 120.

† *Ibid.* pp. 322, 323.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 121.

§ *Church Times*, Nov. 4, 1865.

God, I answer that it is because I believe in myself, for I feel it impossible to believe in my own existence (and of that fact I am quite sure) without believing also in the existence of Him who lives as a Personal, All-seeing, All-judging Being in my conscience.* The question is, "How do we arrive at any knowledge of this Being? whether by a direct revelation from Himself to certain men, or, as we arrive at all other science, by discovery through the use of faculties implanted in us by Him?" All orthodox systems proceed on the first supposition. An aboriginal revelation is assumed, of which gleams and traces exist in the savage now, and existed with greater clearness in the grand religions and philosophies of the old world; then as this grew faint in men's memories, fresh disclosures were made to one people, which alone kept alive for ages the lamp of Truth, and at the last, in the fulness of time, was given the great and crowning Revelation, in the person and teaching of Christ.

Here it is that orthodox Christian opinion divides into two great streams. To whom is granted the power of interpreting this revelation to meet the needs and the questions of succeeding ages? Is the explanation in the voice of a living Church, or, as it were, codified in a book? To us, who belong to neither of these sections of orthodoxy, it seems that Dr. Newman is in the right, rather than his opponents,—that of all who assume a revelation, the most Catholic are the most consistent. And if the alternative were presented to us of an infallible Church or an infallible Book, we are bound to say the former presents less grave difficulties, and entails less of spiritual bondage.

The position, however, of those who would place theology on the same basis as other sciences,—who believe its subject-matter is to be investigated by man's faculties, call them natural or call them divine, to us the terms are much the same,—who regard all knowledge whatever as progressive and no discovery as final,—is antagonistic to dogma, for this simple reason, that all dogma regards its subjects as closed, and requires that facts should mould themselves in accordance with it. And though they may and must hold certain dogmas, they hold them not as such, or because they are such,

* *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, p. 323.

but as placing in a terse, convenient form convictions which now are theirs, but which they may hereafter see reason to modify. And as the Reformation was the first effort on a very large scale to adapt theory to facts, rather than facts to theory, they consider its true spirit to consist in a negation of dogma, not always or necessarily of the points which are stated dogmatically. Hence they agree with Catholics in their estimate of the Protestant spirit; they admit it leads them sometimes to conclusions very wide of those generally received; that they are embarked on a sea of which no man knows the opposite shore. But they believe on reasonable grounds that there is a shore, and not the waste abyss into which Dr. Newman would send them; they conceive it even possible they may sail round again to orthodoxy, approaching it from a different side, and regarding it from a new point of view.

It is by no means necessary for all minds to trouble themselves with theology or controversy. The Soul may live her life in God with only a vague sense of joy in His being and presence, under very erroneous views about Him or under very correct ones, just as the natural life is lived in air alike by those who are conscious only of the blessing of living, by men of science, or by those who have most mistaken views of chemistry and biology. Such minds have not perhaps the fiercest struggles or the keenest joys, which might unfit them for their own special life's work. But those who do engage in theology, and have adopted what may be called the modern method, and are goaded on by the eager desires of an inquiring spirit, cannot at first or always expect peace. There is ever much to learn and to unlearn, seeming certainties become uncertain, near horizons fade into dim distances. Only the belief that God is leading His people into truth through rough and toilsome ways, and the delight of new discovery, serve to recompense necessary disappointments. And sometimes, in hours of difficulty or weaker health, in loss or trial, there come to the boldest thinkers the wish they could return to the beliefs they have abandoned, and rest. There is in these beliefs so grand an interdependence, so systematic a completeness, as cannot but at times attract us. And we turn our eyes back on them, as some child crying itself to sleep in weariness may long it could wake to find all its nursery tales were true, that

some fairy would come to cut the knot of its perplexities, and free it from hard obedience and stern, though salutary, law. Say what we will, there is a majesty and a logical coherence and a promise of peace about Catholicity which can affect with their charm those whom it most repudiates and calls by the hardest names.

Much more, then, is its sway felt by minds which start from the same point as it does, and have adopted the Protestant spirit only in part. It is impossible but that they should feel from time to time, with more or less clearness, that all their systems are but compromises, and that those who are impatient of compromises, desiring to be logical in their creed, should make a strong effort for the reform of their own personal belief, or of the outward organization to which they belong. That such reform has often, and indeed usually, had a retrogressive tendency, lies, we think, in the fact that the original severance from Catholicity has not been complete, but that roots and fibres of the old tree remain in the soil which seemed so completely changed. For all true reform in a Protestant direction is very silent; is, in fact, a growth, and not a revolution. The Reformation was not in any sense a development of what had gone before; it was the germination of an entirely different principle, which had been buried, and lived, so far as it had life, only beneath the surface. At its birth there was an upheaval and throe of the whole existing order of things. Since that time the Protestant spirit has grown as noiselessly as the Catholic spirit; tumults and revolutions have been among those who have wished to mix discordant elements in the same vessel, and found them explode in their hands. It is from the fact that dogma is essentially Catholic, that movement within dogmatic churches has so constantly taken a Catholic direction. There are no Protestant dogmas as such; and so long as any hold to any article because it is dogmatically stated, it is impossible they should frankly accept the Protestant spirit.

Hence it is that liberal men find it so difficult to combine, and feel themselves in isolated positions; they are in no one community, in no one land; they are necessarily in advance of their surroundings, whether the advance be to good or to evil; their intellectual life is moving in concert, while their spiritual and devotional life is nourished by

many different and even contradictory creeds and forms. The Church of the Future is yet to build, nor have even its theoretical outlines taken definite shape ; the Church of the Past is very visible, and influences the mind of the present in spite of the resistance offered by it. Hence it is that religious reformers have had such power when they could point back to an ideal which they could bid their people endeavour once more to realize.

We have been led to these thoughts in considering the fact that two of the most remarkable religious movements of modern days, both essentially Catholic and dogmatic, should have sprung respectively from the Established Churches of England and Scotland, each representing so large a portion of the religious life of a kingdom and a people priding themselves on, and more than other nations making mention of, their sturdy Protestantism. These are the Tractarian movement, and the rise of the "Catholic Apostolic Church." The adherents of each have been marked by a party nickname. That of Puseyite is dying out, for it is seen to have been founded on a misconception, Dr. Newman, and not Dr. Pusey, having been the real soul of the Oxford revival. That of Irvingite clings still ; and if the members of that Church could bear to be called by the name of any one man on whom they have any lien of affection or dependence, they might be well content to be known by so honourable a title as one derived from the name of Edward Irving.

There were many points of resemblance in the careers of the two great leaders. Each, while departing most widely from all the current opinion of the religious body in which he was nurtured, insisted and believed that he was bringing out the true spirit of its formularies, the one expounding the Articles in Tract 90, the other constantly appealing to the old standards of his mother Church. Each, while driven out at the last,—Dr. Newman by constant persecution, Mr. Irving by formal vote,—was only forced to the step which others had long seen to be impending ; each went to what he believed the ancient Catholic Church, though Dr. Newman thought it still existed, and Mr. Irving saw it rising as it were anew from the dying embers of the past. Each was honoured by the devotion of friends to a degree as rare as are the loftiness and unselfishness and purity of character

which call for such a tribute. Each was said, after his change or development of faith, by those who did not follow him, to have sensibly deteriorated in vigour of intellect, and to have become dissatisfied with his new creed : the first statement in either case has been belied by published writings, while of the second there is not only no proof, but much to lead to a strong conviction of the contrary. In both cases, the reaction was Catholic, though the Catholic Apostolic Church is no friend to the See of St. Peter, but rather added a fourth channel in which Catholic thought might run, to the three already existing, the Roman, the Greek or Eastern, and the high Anglican. The Catholic section of the Church of England has done in these last years things of which Dr. Newman can scarce have dared dream, and has asserted doctrine beyond what in his time seemed possible. But its members seem quite unconscious that, however they may please themselves, the world beyond them cares little about them ; all its interest is in the grand old man whom to know is to love, in his semi-monastic cell at Birmingham. So also the Catholic Apostolic Church makes little mark on theology or society. We speak advisedly when we say, that we know no section of Christians whose standard of family and social life is so high, and who come so near their standard. They have among them very excellent preachers and able men of various professions, while those of their body who under their strict ecclesiastical discipline are allowed to argue on matters of faith and practice, are most ready controversialists. "I am told on authority, on which I can depend," writes one of that Church to ourselves, "that probably the number of those receiving the restored apostles has doubled, or perhaps trebled, during the last ten years. The increase has been most rapid in Prussia and Switzerland, though in some parts of England it is also very marked." Yet surely the impress made on the age is very incommensurate with all this. Even the influence of the late Mr. Drummond was in spite of, and not in consequence of, the fact that he was the "Apostle of Scotland," and the general interest in the nascent Church of so great claims and so great promise was buried in the grave of him who, rightly or wrongly, is considered its founder. Not that we would assert for one moment that popular acceptance is in any degree a test of

truth ; we simply wish to draw attention to the fact that in the one case, as in the other, the interest for the outside public is summed up in a single man. The two movements were nearly contemporary, yet Irving's early death throws that to which his name belongs into a past generation. The time is not come (and may it be far distant) when it will be needful to write Dr. Newman's life, and in so doing to revive long-buried writings ; but with Irving the case is different ; no words nor controversy can affect him, and rouse a sleeping lion ; "praise and blame sound in his ear alike ;" his co-religionists are too fair and candid to expect all to agree with them, and of Irving's character there can now be but one opinion. Therefore let us speak of him and his teaching while round the picture of one who was like a saint of olden time there is still not only the halo of beatitude, but the memory of personal affection.

Of him and of his teaching, for the two are inseparable. There are books, and those not without their value, even sermons of intrinsic worth, which might have been written by any man who has the required amount of brain, the individuality of the author is so little reflected in them. Again, there are teachers of men who can put off the teacher with their ecclesiastical vestment, and lay aside human sympathies as easily when they resume it again. Edward Irving was not one of these. The hot blood of a common humanity glows in his fervid eloquence, but he was a ministering priest at all times and places of his life. No details of family life seemed to him incongruous with the deepest spiritual matters ; whether he ate or drank, he did all to the glory of God. He could rise in the midst of a dinner party to pray for a young man who seemed to him a scoffer. He could write to a Mr. Dods, who had impugned his doctrine, a letter full of the deepest theology, containing his whole creed on the subject of the Incarnation, and conclude it thus : "Let us just regard each other, as in truth we are, two fellow-labourers in the vineyard of the Lord. I write this without the knowledge of any one, *my wife lying asleep on the sofa beside me, and my porritch cooling before me.*"*

Of course the higher nature a man is of, the more will

* Life, &c., p. 281.

his daily earthly life be interpenetrated by his spiritual life; and of this man Mr. Carlyle, keen, astute, sceptical, the discoverer of shams and intolerant of orthodoxy, has said, "His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with: I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever, after trial enough, found in this world, or now hope to find."* But into the details of this life we cannot enter minutely. Mrs. Oliphant's well-known *Life of Edward Irving* will place them before such as do not yet know them, always readably, for the most part accurately, and with a good deal of insight into character. As we have no power, so have we no wish, to find fault with the fame of a book which has reached a fourth edition; but a recent re-reading has shewn us its faults more clearly than at first. The subject is too great for the grasp of the biographer, who rushes into inflated language calculated to cast an idea of unreality round one of the most real of men, and who is apparently so pleased with her rounded periods and picturesque groupings, that she has not always chosen, as we shall presently shew, to alter manifest and proved inaccuracies. Neither has her mind that due balance which would enable her to do justice to Irving's surroundings. While seeking to extol, she has really depreciated him, by dwarfing the intellectual standard of the 800 who followed him from the National Scotch Church to his home in Newman Street; and the same unconscious influence has led her, as we think, greatly to underrate his wife and his more immediate circle of friends. And the later chapters labour under the radical defect of being written without any sympathy for the opinions which were developing so rapidly in Irving's mind. However widely an author may stand aloof from the views of those he describes, he ought to endeavour to place himself in their position, or at least to look at the phenomena patiently and calmly. This Mrs. Oliphant has not done. She has unphilosophically set the whole thing down in her own mind as nonsense, and then, naturally puzzled that Irving held the opinions he did, has been angry with those who, as she thinks, encouraged him at first, and finally forced him into strange paths.

No such fault can be found with all the former part of

* Carlyle: *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. III. p. 299.

the book, a very good bit of biography, from which we must hurriedly take a few dates and leading facts.

Edward Irving, the son of respectable burgher parents, long time established on the shores of the Solway Firth, was born at Annan, August 4th, 1792. His childhood and youth seem to have been in no special degree remarkable, except that the life of a Scotch lad who is cast, as so many are, on his own resources at the age of thirteen, into a great city to get himself educated as best he may, is always remarkable compared with the careful fencing round which is bestowed on English lads of the same age, and long afterwards. At Edinburgh, and possibly before, since both were dwellers on Solway side, he came into relations with Thomas Carlyle, so cordial and affectionate, that no wide diversity of opinion or divergence of career were able to sever them. With proud independence he spent the time between his pupilage and his ministry in teaching, first at Haddington, afterwards at Kirkaldy. Education was then more advanced in Scotland than in England, and he seems to have held a position somewhat above that of a first-class parish schoolmaster among us, while he had some pupils, of both sexes, of more than average powers. At Haddington also he was private tutor to Miss Welsh, who afterwards became the pupil, and then the wife, of Thomas Carlyle. It was perhaps in part the remembrance of his little charge whom he had loved so well, and in part the natural chivalry of the man, which made him foster such a spirit of reverence for girlhood among the rough lads of his school, that violent games were suspended while they passed by, and this, so far as our experience goes, is the very opposite turn to that which matters usually take in our "mixed schools." Among his pupils was the daughter of the minister of Kirkaldy, that Isabella Martin whom he afterwards married, who thus as child and wife alike was his trusting pupil, and more than this, his friend and counsellor, a brave, true-hearted woman. She at no time, as Mrs. Oliphant alleges she did, "contributed to the clouding of his genius," for the simple reason that it blazed bright and unclouded to the end. A single extract from one of her letters tells more of what she was than a volume. "You know well," writes Mrs. Irving in 1830, "from my feeling and acting in regard to dear

Edward, that I am not one who is continually in fear about health, when a man is doing the Lord's work."*

To go back, however, to Irving himself. He left Kirkaldy in 1818, being then 25 years old, with a view to getting permanent clerical employ, and in consequence ordination. He had long been a probationer and licensed to preach, was in fact serving a quasi diaconate, for the Kirk of Scotland admits none to full orders till such time as he is provided with a definite sphere of work. This, after much weariness of waiting, after his eager desires for work had almost led him into missionary enterprise, he found as assistant or curate to Dr. Chalmers at St. John's Church, Glasgow. This was in the autumn of 1819, when he was 27, in the full vigour of youth and strength. He plunged at once into what, if a man so chooses to make it, is the enormous work of a great city parish. He had nerve and sinew to meet it, for his stature and strength were far above those of ordinary people; in fact, the whole man seems to have been in keeping with the power of his voice, of which he says himself, after preaching to 13,000 people, "My voice easily reached over them all;" and which was reported by others to have been heard distinctly a quarter of a mile off, and indistinctly at double that distance.† But though he worked with his whole heart, though he was loved and valued by all who came in immediate contact with him, he was not appreciated in Glasgow. Perhaps his burning nature was stifled in working under one so hard and matter-of-fact as Dr. Chalmers. Once more his thoughts turned to foreign fields of mission labour, when in the winter of 1821-22 he was offered and accepted the charge of the Caledonian Church in London, a small building and small society, on which he entered in July 1822.

Here it is fittest to pause in this hasty sketch, and consider what message this young man had to deliver, who almost at once took the religious world of London by storm, and held in the thrall of his voice and wonderful eloquence, not the idle crowd who flock to hear the rant and verbiage of a Spurgeon or a Bellew, but hard-headed and fastidious men like Sir James Mackintosh and Canning.

* *Life, &c.*, p. 300.

† *Ibid.* p. 265.

The present republication of Mr. Irving's works, named at the head of this article, is by no means all that we could desire from which to arrive at a conclusion on this point. Messrs. Strahan have done their part well ; the type is beautiful, the errors in it few, the paper of a pleasant tone to the eye—in fact, the book is thoroughly readable, which is much to say in these days, when so many books are got up cheaply and nastily. But, "collected" though the works may be, some of the most remarkable are omitted, nor are they "edited" as we ordinarily understand the word. Dates are given sparingly throughout. There are two papers in Vol. V., on *The Church* and on *The Gifts of the Spirit*, of which almost the whole importance depends on this very point. The editorial notes might be included in a single page, and we rarely find information where we most need it ; for instance, in the reprint of the treatise on *Missionaries* after the *Apostolic School*, there is no word to shew how much or how little was the original discourse which set all *Evangelical London* in a blaze. Some of Mr. Irving's most characteristic writings are omitted, such as the *Preface to Ben Ezra*, nor are there any reprints of the papers which appeared in the "*Morning Watch*," a quarterly *Journal of Prophecy*. These surely should have been reprinted under each year, with the salient events of that year in Irving's life prefixed, so as to allow all readers to measure the growth and change in his opinions. The fact would seem to be, that Mr. Carlyle, as Irving's nephew, and the minister of a congregation of that Church which cast his uncle out, is in a difficult position. We could wish the edition had been undertaken either by a man untrammelled by Scotch orthodoxy, or by one of those still nearer relations of Mr. Irving who hold fast by his views, and those which have been developed in his Church since his death. We are not unthankful for what record of the man we have, but we feel we might and ought to have had a better.

To say that at this time Irving was in fact, and in his own estimation, a loyal Presbyterian, would be to give a very faint notion of his devotion to the Church of his baptism and his orders. He regarded it as a branch, and an essential one, of the Church Catholic, pure from every stain of false doctrine, possessed of an almost ideal holiness. It

was invested to him with a sort of personēity, and he served it as in Fouqué's beautiful fiction Aslauga's knight served his mystic mistress.

He could see, indeed, shortcomings, but these were the faults of individuals or of aggregations of individuals. Of herself he speaks thus :

"Remember how your fathers, the common people of a former age, loved her, and for her sake made want their portion, and the waste wilderness their abode, and arms their unwonted occupation. Remember how she sprung from their hearty love and embrace of God's Word, and their hatred of intermeddling men. They dressed her vineyard, and it became fruitful ; they defended it, and it became strong and terrible, and it did yield them wine and milk, while the nations around fed on sourest grapes. Your civil rights she gave you ; your education that lifts you to stations of confidence ; your high standard of moral purity, whence come your temperance and sobriety ; your taste for reading and knowledge, whence comes your adventure ; and lastly, your prudent and faithful character, which makes you welcome among the nations."*

He seems to the last to have believed that his countrymen were sober and regarded wherever they might come.

Thus, again, he speaks of the Presbyterian form of the Kirk, when already he had been some years in London, and his opinions on many subjects were changing. He is giving an ordination charge to a friend :

"I would charge thee with thy duty as a Churchman, that is an ordained minister of the Kirk of Scotland, whom the Presbytery have this day bound by solemn obligation to maintain the doctrine, discipline, laws and government thereof, which thou must study, imbuing thyself with the spirit of our reformers and martyrs and covenanters, and looking through the cloud of the Papal apostacy into the Presbyterian discipline and primitive worship of the Culdees. Thou art this day honoured to be a minister of the most primitive Church under heaven, not excepting the Waldenses or Albigenes ; for though the apostacy had possession of the court of Scotland for about three centuries, it never had possession of the whole land ; in the western fastnesses of which the true fire continued to live upon the altar. I pray thee, brother, to remember this day that thou art the member of a Church which hath oft covenanted together for the purity of Christian policy [polity ?], to testify against all Papal and Prela-

* Farewell Discourse at St. John's, Glasgow : Works, Vol. III. p. 357.

tical invasions, which God built up in the whirlwind, and strengthened in the midst of the storm.”*

We suppose, however, he must have been very different to the majority of Scotch ministers then, as now, in that he seems always to have repudiated that whole system known as Calvinistic. He even defended the Westminster Confession from the charge of teaching particular redemption, and said that if he believed that doctrine were embodied in it, he “would denounce it as an ungodly book, and move the Church to have it condemned of heresy, instead of exalting it as a standard of orthodoxy.”† It is true, indeed, that, so far as we can discover, these words were not written till 1833, but there can be no doubt that the teaching contained in them was that he had long and habitually put forth. In his treatise, *Of Judgment to Come*, not reprinted in these volumes, published in 1823, he writes :

“I allow that if God had actually consigned some portion of men to these awful abodes, brought them into being, bred them up in wicked training, that He might ship them off like Africans to work His pleasure in the infernal pit, I should have stood amazed and horror-struck, no less than they, and cried, Let such a tenet (the belief in hell) be hunted from the face of the earth, back again into the detestable brain that bred it.”‡

It must not be thought, however, that he ever preached Universalism, or any sort of purgatory. Such doctrine he held to be “the most daring invasion upon the prerogative of God, the most monstrous abuse of His gracious revelation, and the most dangerous unloosing of its power over men.”§ His views on the Priesthood, that he was no mere minister—on the Sacraments, that they were no mere signs, but real means of grace, were already becoming those still held in the Catholic Apostolic Church, which are nearly identical with those held by the High-church Anglican school. The Bible was of course to him the “Word of God,” much of it delivered in “oracles” and dark sayings. For the rest, he had a horror of what he considered false doctrine. “To the

* Ordination Charge : Works, Vol. I. pp. 532, 533.

† Notes on the Standards of the Church of Scotland : Works, Vol. I. p. 641.

‡ Orations, &c., p. 422.

§ Ibid. p. 420.

Papaey and to the Socinian thou owest no mercy. Unfold their vileness, cry against them with all thy might.* He had an equal dread of liberal opinions. He spoke of "the serpent-cunning of the liberal spirit," of "the irreligiousness of liberality," of "our poor countrymen preyed on by Satan under the guise of liberality." All the movements to which we now look back with pride and joy—Reform, some Continental Revolutions, the Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts—were to him simply intolerable and hateful. And by no uncommon inconsistency, he was in practice most loving and tolerant and tender, with a heart which beat with all who suffered in purse or in person, for the outcast sinner as for the afflicted saint.

Such was Edward Irving when his preaching brought him into a notice which he never courted, and which never shook the simplicity of his life. He was no mob orator, nor fell into that dangerous snare of a popular preacher, to say the thing which pleases and draws. Men came to hear him because he and his eloquence were alike great; there was no one else like him or near him. He seems to us to have been one of the three very great preachers during the present century, the others being Dr. Newman and the late Mr. Robertson, of Brighton. In mere pomp and majesty of words he was perhaps the superior of both, certainly of Dr. Newman, whose eloquence is always pruned and chastened; but he wanted the power of concentration, of saying much in a few words. From the sermons of his great rivals sentences may be quoted, from Mr. Irving passages. Hence the bulk of these volumes. There is much thought there, vigorous and good, but spread over too large a surface; the music of his own sentences would seem to have carried him away. He lacked the systematic training of an English university, and, whether from want of time or from undervaluing secular studies, he was never a student, neither did he keep up with what was best in the current literature of the time. These drawbacks were little felt when the living voice of the man breathed out its mighty music to eager listeners; they are painfully apparent now; and the thought is often lost in the manifold coils of the language, rather than unfolded by it.

* Ordination Charge, Vol. I. p. 536.

But who can wonder that, if for nothing else, people came in crowds to hear such words as these :

"For truly I abominate the spirit of ascetic and ignorant devotion, which to make men spiritual would deprive them of the recreations of sense, and spoil them of the high pleasures of intellect ; would make them crouch every noble part of manhood, disguise every high propensity of nature, school into slavishness every ardent imagination, and bind in shackles every high adventure, in order to present unto God a minced and emasculated pigmy of that creature which He made a little lower than the angels, and a fraction of those talents which He made able to scan the highest heavens. Away with the notion to the cells of monks and the grates of nuns and the caves of hermits—it is not for the honour of man, nor for the glory of God. Spiritual life is that which pervades everything with a divine vigour—stirring up and awakening lethargic faculties, calling in roving and wicked thoughts, husbanding time, enlightening conscience, piloting all the courses, filling all the sails of action, that we may make a demonstration for God ten times greater than the demonstration we were making for sense, for intellect or for morals."*

Or again, the following passage, in which he pleads the cause of the Mendicity Society :

"First, for the conviction of those who come forth out-of-doors to solicit, I commend to you the support of the Mendicity Society, which undertakes on a large scale the inquisition of those characters whom no private inspection could wind through all their deceitful haunts. Their tickets will relieve your charitable feelings when they are excited by street petition ; their inspection will take care that your charitable feelings are not cast away upon the undeserving. But it is not street solicitors, but misery in its thousand retiring forms of shame, poverty struggling hard to keep its head above the wave, worth pining in neglect, iniquity trampled over by necessity, shame waiting for forgiveness, heart-sick vice longing for virtuous paths, dishonour too severely punished, virtue too severely tried, health prostrated through over-exertion of body and over-anxiety of mind, disease preying upon famished frames, the wants of nature unsupplied, souls unevangelized, children uneducated, wives and families deserted or borne down by graceless husbands and unaffectionate fathers. These and a thousand other forms of misery harbour unseen, and cry to Heaven for redress ; and Heaven crieth to men in this holy book, but men hear not, and the abject miserales perish

* *Oration, &c. : Of Judgment to Come, p. 459.*

for evermore. Ohon! Onon! a fancy cometh upon my brain which I dare hardly utter, lest it overwhelm the feeling of this assembly, and unman myself into unbecoming weeping. I fancy in some sad abode of this city, upon some unvisited pallet of straw, a man, a Christian man, pining, perishing without an attendant, looking his last upon nakedness and misery, feeling his last in the pangs of hunger and thirst. The righteous spirit of the man being disembodied, I fancy him to myself arising to Heaven, encircled by an attendance of celestial spirits, daughters of mercy, who waited upon his soul when mankind deserted his body—this attended spirit I fancy rising up to the habitation of God, and reporting in the righteous ear of the Governor of the earth how it fared with him amidst all the extravagance and outlay of this city. And saith the indignant Governor of men, 'They had not a morsel of bread nor a drop of water to bestow upon My saint. Who of My angels will go for Me where I shall send? Go, thou angel of famine, break the growing ear with thy wing, and let mildew feed upon their meal. Go, thou angel of plague, and shake thy wings once more over the devoted city. Go, thou angel of fire, and consume all the neighbourhood where My saint suffered unheeded and unpitied. Burn it; and let its flame not quench till their pavilions are a heap of smouldering ashes.'”*

For the way in which Mr. Irving's ministry was sought, how the congregation soon outgrew the chapel, and flooded the large church built in its stead, how the spirit of the man burnt clear and steady, untroubled by gusts of applause, undimmed by the coarse incense of praise, we must refer our readers to Mrs. Oliphant. In her pages they will also find that “with the flatterers were busy mockers who gnashed upon him with their teeth.” No man on such an eminence was ever free from them, and the usual mode of attack is to raise a cry of heresy, as they did in Mr. Irving's case. He had spoken and taught heterodoxy, they said, about the human nature of Christ. This is a point we are scarcely competent to discuss. We start from different premisses to those both of Irving and his opponents. No doubts had crossed their minds but that the prophets predicted Jesus of Nazareth knowingly and almost by name. No suspicion that the earlier chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke's Gospels had grown out of a faith, rather than a faith out of

* Works, Vol. II. pp. 48, 49.

them, had occurred to them. A whole gigantic system of scriptural interpretation, which is not ours, was necessarily theirs. We could no more attempt to decide between Mr. Irving and his opponents, than a modern astronomer between shades of difference in the views of two people who alike believe that the earth is the centre of the universe. But so far as we *can* understand and enter into the controversy, Mr. Irving's position seems the more human and reasonable of the two. Despairing of the attempt to make the matter quite clear to ourselves, much less to our readers, we must let Mr. Irving speak for himself.

"The great point between us, the precious truth for which we contend, is not whether Christ's flesh was holy—for surely the man who saith we deny this blasphemeth against the manifest truth—but whether during His life it was one with us in all its infirmities and liabilities to temptation, or whether by the miraculous generation it underwent a change, so as to make it a different body from the rest of the brethren. They argue for an identity of origin merely; we argue for an identity of life also. They argue for an inherent holiness; we argue for a holiness maintained by the person of the Son, through the operation of the Holy Ghost. They say that though His body was changed in the generation, He was still our fellow in all temptations and sympathies; we deny that it could be so; for change is change, and if His body was changed in the conception, it was not in its life as ours is. In one word, we present believers with a real life; a suffering mortal flesh; a real death and a real resurrection of this flesh of ours; they present the life, death and resurrection of a changed flesh; and so create a chasm between Him and us which no knowledge, not even imagination, can overleap. And in so doing they subvert all foundations: there is nothing left standing in our faith of Godhead, in our hopes of manhood."*

It was on such an abstruse, difficult, intricate matter as this that the clamour was raised, which ended in a legal rejection from the Kirk of Scotland of this its greatest son. When such crisis came, however, a new Church had already risen up in spite of, though out of the body of London Presbyterians, which could confer on Irving, as he considered, higher orders than those he forfeited, and holding an authority yet more divine.

The special doctrine of our Lord's humanity was one

* Works, Vol. V. pp. 565, 566.

only of three subjects which were at this period occupying his mind. In common with many others brought up in various churches and schools of thought, he was searching into the meaning of what was called unfulfilled prophecy. There are those who still busy themselves with such divine riddles, but they are not men of mark ; saner and sounder views have taken the place of those which degraded the prophet to the level of the Pythian priestess, and made the man of spiritual insight, causing him to tell forth eternal laws, into a mere soothsayer gifted with second-sight. Then, however, almost all men believed that modern history was enwrapped in these ancient oracles ; that with the right key, could one only find it, the secrets of those times, confused politically and socially, would open to the diligent student of prophecy. And since almost all prophets had spoken of a day of God to dawn on a darkened people, since Christ and his apostles had spoken of his second coming, what could these confusions mean, but that the day of the Lord was at hand, and a coming of Christ in glory ?

With such expectations earnest students of their Bibles met year after year at Albury, the house of the late Mr. Henry Drummond, and what they sought they found ; for in Biblical studies Mr. Carlyle's dictum is pre-eminently true, that the eye only sees that which it brings with it the power of seeing. The study of prophecy spread through all classes, the signs of the last days were eagerly expected, and as a matter of course they were not long withheld. Like causes always produce like effects, and the spiritual excitement which in one Church produced *L'Estatica*, in another gave birth to the Gift of Tongues, and in both to Miracles.

But this close study of the Bible gave rise to another train of thought. These phenomena which now were recurring had taken place in apostolic days ; it would seem as if they belonged to a pure and true condition of the Church from which she had fallen. Would not God restore again the entire and true constitution of the Church before Christ came again to receive her to himself ? Tongues, Prophets, Apostles, all followed in a natural order, and the word once more was confirmed by signs following. Absurd ! do our readers say ? We beg them to read two Essays in Vol. V. of these collected works on "*The Church*" and "*The Gifts of the Holy Ghost*," dates unfortunately

not given, and which it is impossible to condense, that they may see what can be said for them. We are bound to admit that from the orthodox point of view there is a very strong case for all these. If prophecy is indeed foretelling, when was the power withdrawn? If by miracles God's laws were once reversed, when did they cease? The account of the speaking in tongues in the Corinthian Church, certainly leads to the impression that it was an ecstatic, and, to the multitude, incomprehensible utterance; the supposition that the apostles were an order of men intended to continue, stands on nearly or quite as good grounds as the declaration of the Church of England, that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons." For men's sins these apostles, who alone could fit the Church for Christ, had been withdrawn; now, perhaps, in answer to prayer they would be restored, before the coming of the Lord. And since prayer has a wonderful tendency to beget an answer to itself, restored they were before men had prayed for them very long.

We have not the space to go into the history of the gradual outpouring of the gifts, or of the restoration of the apostles, and the organization of the Church. This only we can say as having given much patient thought to this subject for years, and speaking with intimate knowledge of many members of the Catholic Apostolic Church: we earnestly beg our readers to dismiss once for all from their minds in connection with this movement all idea of imposture or impiety. The question is far deeper than this, and on the opinion we form of these manifestations, soberly considered, will depend our opinion of apostolic and all miracles, all prophecy, all ecstasy, whether of Mary Campbell, of Fernicarry, or of St. Paul raised in spirit to heaven.

But however these gifts and manifestations fell into their natural places in a new Church after apostles were "restored," it is obvious that speaking in tongues was strangely incongruous with the decorous dullness of Presbyterian ritual. Hence the scandal was great when the revival passed into the Regent Square Church, *after ser-*

mons from its pastor on the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. His own struggle was great between his belief that these manifestations were of God and his desire of order in public worship. But it could end only one way. It was impossible to "resist God." The tongues and prophetic utterances became more and more frequent, the alarm of his Presbytery greater, and the doors of his Church were at last for ever closed against him in the first week in May 1832. Though, however, his Presbytery were not with him, he was followed by almost his whole church, consisting of 800 communicants, to whom he continued still to minister as a clergyman of the Scotch Church. He had ceased to hold office in Regent Square, but his orders were still intact, nor was it pretended these acts were such as to call for his deposition, however discordant they may have been with time-honoured ritual arrangement.

The congregation, after some wandering homelessness, found refuge in a picture-gallery in Newman Street, over the door of which till a very few years since were still printed the words, Catholic Apostolic Church, and where they remained till the opening of the great and conspicuous building in Gordon Square. Here it was that the organization and ceremonies began to thrust aside the old Presbyterian forms and gain a somewhat of Catholic magnificence. Here it was that by the voice of Prophecy six apostles were called out to rule the Church, before Mr. Irving's death. After that date six more were added, making up the mystical number, that of the first college of apostles, and of the twelve tribes. These, we believe, were understood to represent the different parts or districts of Christendom over which the restored 'apostles were to bear rule. Mr. Irving was not called as an apostle, nor was he, we believe, a prophet, neither did he speak with tongues. But he remained, as he had ever been, the chief pastor of that congregation, the Angel, as the minister in charge of each church began to be called. He was not shelved in any degree or slighted, and though the details of what took place were ordered by others in prophecy, yet the whole was what he had prayed for and foreseen as necessary in his estimation to the perfectness and well-being of the Church. So in ordering and building up his people under, as it seemed to him, the immediate direction of God's Spirit, passed the

rest of this year. In the spring of 1833, he was summoned to appear before the Presbytery of Annan, which had ordained him, on the old charge of heresy, and on that ground he was deposed.

By this time it would seem his lofty views of the authority of the Church of Scotland had given place to a more moderate estimate of what she had granted or could take away. His commission at least to preach came far more directly from heaven than was the case by means of orders so conferred. Hence we find he had no scruple in making a preaching tour of a few days through his native district. And naturally enough, holding the strong views he did on the subject of the doctrine which was in controversy, he denounced the Church as having disowned her Lord. Hence he returned to London to resume his position in his own Church.

Here it was that a circumstance occurred which Mrs. Oliphant has related in her own way, a way considered most inaccurate by Mr. Irving's own family, and by the members of his Church, who well know that whereof they speak. We give Mrs. Oliphant's words.

"Deposed by his mother Church, he returned to Newman Street, to the little community which according to ordinary ideas he himself had originated and brought together, and of which he was supposed to be the ruling influence, and when he arrived there *with his wounded heart*, he was received, not with extraordinary honour as a martyr, but with an immediate interdict 'in the power,' forbidding him to exercise *any* priestly function, to administer sacraments, or *to assume anything out of the province of a deacon*, the lowest office in the newly-formed Church. One of his relations writes with affectionate indignation that he was not permitted even to preach, except in those less sacred assemblies in which the outer world of unbelievers were admitted to meet the Church. Such an inconceivable indignity, according to all human rules, did the spiritual authorities whom his constant and steadfast faith had made masters of his flock put upon their former leader. . . . Those *lingering* March days glided on through all the oft devotions of the Church; the prophets spoke, and the elders ruled; but in the midst of them Irving waited, listening *vistfully* if *perhaps* the voice from heaven might come to restore him to that office which was the vocation of his life. *At last*, while he sat in the lowest place, . . . the utterance once more called the *forlorn* but dauntless warrior to take up his arms.

. . . . That office in which for so many sorrowful days his surprised soul had been stopped short and put aside, was restored to him. . . . Meanwhile domestic anxiety once more came in to heighten his other troubles, and the youngest of his children fell ill. 'His mother said that the Lord had punished their child for their sin,' writes Mrs. Hamilton (Mrs. Irving's sister) in April, 'which sin I think they conceive specially to be Edward's having remained in Scotland, after meeting with the Presbytery,' an error for which she proceeds to say he was sharply rebuked by the Church after he returned."*

The italics in the above extracts are our own, to draw attention to those words by which point is lent to a most inaccurate statement. It has been contradicted, with dates which take the colour from Mrs. Oliphant's narrative, by a writer in Fraser's Magazine; by Mr. Cardale, who reordained Mr. Irving, writing from memory; by still nearer and closer friends in private letters to the author. The text stands as it did, and only one of these contradictions finds its way into a note. Mr. Kinglake has taken the same line about some of the unanswerable criticisms on his book, and we fear it is a practice which may grow; it is one alike offensive and dishonest, since it refuses to believe those alone who are intimately acquainted with the circumstances, and suppresses evidence on which readers might form their own opinion. Mr. Cardale writes as one not quite certain of his dates, though he has said what to any candid mind ought to have carried conviction; these dates we are able to give accurately.

He was deposed by the Presbytery on Wednesday, March 13, 1833. On Saturday he wrote to his wife, dated "Summerhill by Dumfries," March 16th, 1833. He says:

"To-day I preach on the sands at 1 o'clock; to-morrow" (which must have been Sunday, March 17th) "I worship with the flock in the forenoon, in the morning and afternoon I preach. . . . On Monday" (March 18) "I proceed to Castle Douglas about noon to preach, and in the afternoon at Kirkcudbright." "On Tuesday" (March 19) "I spend the time as — shall arrange it. To be back here on Wednesday" (March 20), "the market day, to preach, and then proceed through Lochmaben, Lockerby, Ecclefechan, Kirkpatrick, Graitney, Dornoch, and back to Annan, — the Lord furthering me and blessing me through your prayers.

* Life, pp. 396 - 398.

Nevertheless, if I receive any call home, I am at the Lord's bidding."*

Now here is not only no regret expressed for what had just passed, but a feeling that he was about his Master's business, and an expectation that he might be called home, not as from "sin," but for a higher work. He left himself six places to visit after Wednesday, March 20th, for which we must surely allow him the three remaining days, bringing him back to Annan on Sunday, the 24th. Between this day and Sunday, the 31st, he returned to London, and, says Mr. Cardale,† "*resumed all his accustomed duties.*" On the 31st (Mr. Cardale is uncertain as to the date, but that we have given is accurate), "as he was proceeding to baptize an infant, there was a word spoken to the effect that what the Church of Scotland had given, the Church of Scotland could withdraw, and therefore that he should not administer the sacraments until he should again receive ordination." Mrs. Oliphant mentions a letter to Mr. Dow, in which Mr. Irving exults over what had occurred; it is given in Fraser's Magazine, Jan. 1863; but she does not name the fact that the being "sharply rebuked in the Church," has been flatly contradicted by his own family; while Mrs. Hamilton, who says that he had been so rebuked, was one of those who had not followed his teaching or his fortunes, and was therefore disposed to see the dark side of all that was done towards him by those who had been more loyal than her husband and herself, though their personal affection remained as strong as ever.

But more than this: it is evident that if Irving's congregation had followed his teaching on the sacraments, he *could* not administer them without ordination. His priesthood was taken away, and he must wait for its re-imposition. His proceeding to baptize was a mechanical, though inconsistent act; his stoppage was in accordance with all that he had taught, and was thankfully accepted. But he was ordained on Friday, April 5th, Good Friday, before any other sacraments needed administration; there was never from the first the smallest doubt about it or delay, so that "the lingering March days" and the "perhaps" are untrue in fact and insinuation. "I know," says one who

* MS. letter.

† Life, p. 396, note.

has most reason at once to know and speak feelingly,—“I know it to be utterly false that he was in any way slighted by those to whom he returned after his deposition at Annan.”* We need not go into other matters, in which, as it seems, Mrs. Oliphant is equally unfair to Edward Irving’s friends and Church. He was a great and good man ; but one who is such is recognized by his own intrinsic nobleness ; it adds nothing to the human stature to endeavour to debase those who stand round him. Gulliver was not himself greater, but made to seem in a somewhat ridiculous and unworthy position, when he was planted in the kingdom of Lilliput. So unreal a world has Mrs. Oliphant raised round her hero from want of sympathy with his true spiritual life.

In the full development and organization of the Catholic Apostolic Church, Edward Irving would have seen the earthly reward of his labours ; he heartily acquiesced in all that was done, and as each apostle was called out he saw in him another herald and earnest of his returning Lord. His trials were by no means from within the Church, but from officious friends without, who strove with him against convictions which were a part of his very self.

We do not profess to understand the present position of the Catholic Apostolic Church with reference to the coming of the Lord ; we only imagine they believe with more entire reality what other orthodox churches also profess to hold ; but then the Saviour was held to be very near, even at the door,—so near that missionary work seemed useless, and vigorous out-door preaching vain, when He was coming whose great reign on earth would restore all things. The faith was the revival of pure Catholic teaching, the Church that which Christ had established ; and in that faith, within that body, Irving waited for his Lord.

His unceasing labours had told on his frame ; friends urged his seeking a warmer southern clime ; but work, entirely self-imposed, took him once more to Scotland, to build up in the faith churches which had already given in their adhesion to the restored apostles. The only rest he would give himself was that he went by way of Wales, and lingered a little as he went in the fair September weather of 1834.

* MS. letter.

But from Liverpool, in October, he wrote for his wife, who hurried up to nurse him, and went with him to Glasgow. There, trusting almost to the last that a miracle would be wrought to raise him up and enable him, still in life, to meet his Lord, he died on Sunday, December 7th. But though he had not expected this end, it could have no terror for a man so brave, so true, so pure, who had, moreover, borne the thought of the dread Judge of quick and dead coming at once to meet him face to face. His last words were, "If I die, I die unto the Lord. Amen." "After life's fitful fever he sleeps well." He is in the hands of God, and there is scarce need to pray over him the old Catholic prayer, "Requiescat in Pace."

It was a noble life which ended thus, and it ended, as so many others have done, in success or in failure, according to the point from which we view it. Failure, if Mr. Carlyle's estimate be true. "Ever wilder waxed the confusion without and within. The misguided, noble-minded, had now nothing left to do but die."* Failure, if orthodoxy on the Scottish pattern is the desirable and beautiful thing Scotchmen deem it. Failure, if to find, when death comes, *one* mistake in belief, while in all other respects the soul is comforted in the calmness of an absolute trust. But if to build up a great congregation in rare devotion of life and purity of morals is good—if amid temptation to vanity and pride and lust of power it be noble to keep a heart simple and leal as that of a little child—if to have left on men's memories, even of those who differ most widely, an impression of rare personal holiness, is to succeed, then Edward Irving's life was no failure.

He whose work we have thus endeavoured to sketch and estimate, would have had no toleration for us, much as we admire him. Doctrines which we do not hold were to him the very foundation of truth, and they who were not with him were fighting against God. Our admiration for him, and his detestation of the liberal spirit in all things, and specially in theology, make him a most fitting centre for certain thoughts not without deep importance in these our days.

When we contrast our own opinions—and by this we

* *Miscellanies*, Vol. III. p. 299.

mean the general tone and current of liberal thought—with those forms of orthodoxy with which we usually come in contact, there are for the most part certain disturbing elements which hinder our fair judgment, and tend to introduce a certain acrimoniousness of controversy into subjects which need dispassionate calmness. If we think of Rome, a host of social and political questions trouble the theological atmosphere. It was in opposition to Roman dogma that the liberal spirit first clothed itself in definite form. There are details of the mode in which Rome presents Catholicity, that catch men's attention and draw them off from an examination of principles. Within the Church of England, the liberal and catholic tendencies of the day are in remarkable juxtaposition, yet it may not be denied that liberals are in a minority; that it is conceivable their position may become untenable; the status of neither party is sufficiently defined to enable us to consider impartially the struggle which may come so near our own doors. For without or within its pale, loyal sons or open enemies, no Englishman would deny that great organization to have a power and an interest extending very widely beyond its own borders. The Eastern Church is too far from us to enable us to look on it with any familiarity of intimate inspection; the Kirk of Scotland and the orthodox Dissenters claim to be Protestant, while insisting on dogma with a more than Papal pertinacity.

But here is a body, close to, yet apart from us, which we can study free from all disturbing influences, sprung from a Protestantism which would repudiate our judgment when we dare call it bastard and incomplete, naming itself Catholic, yet neither Roman, nor Anglican, nor Greek. In it we see dogma, so soon as it strives to be more than the mere shibboleth of partizanship, becoming retrograde, and setting itself directly at issue with modern thought. In it is shewn in a most marked manner the tendency to regard the Church, not as the whole of mankind considered on the religious side, gradually led nearer and nearer to God, feeling its way to Him by the powers He has given, but as an Ecclesia, called out and standing over against a sinful world, into whose ear are whispered divine intimations of truth not given or to be given to all. In it is seen the logical issue of such belief, hinted and implied more or less

in other Churches also, the expectation of a day when a personal Antichrist shall stand opposed to a personal Christ, who shall destroy for ever all that is against Him. In it there is *not* seen, nor within any dogmatic Church except by sufferance, any conception of the work of Christ and God as the rising of some great wave, which drowns none, but bears all floating on its bosom into new lands and the light of a fuller day. In it is not seen, nor can be seen, any expectation of a reign of God which shall be established in the conversion of all and the destruction of none.

Yet this is the hope which in the hearts of men is rising ever clearer, which finds expression from within dogmatic Churches, declaring itself not inconsistent with their formularies, though contrary to the popular opinion of their members; this is one great root of the growing controversy between the spirit of the past in religion, and the awakening spirit of the future. The time is fast coming, as it seems to us, when it will no longer be possible to hold to both sides, to be Catholic without following out Catholic principles to their logical conclusion, or Protestant without rejecting all dogmatic teaching. The ranks of each side will close up, distant bands coalesce, and the battle, no more of Creeds but of Principles, will draw into a closer battle-field. This is the meaning of the "Association for the Unity of Christendom," of the alliance of High-churchmen and Evangelicals, as in recent movements in the Church of England; this, of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*. And though the Catholic Apostolic Church seems to hold aloof, its end is the same, and in great measure its tactics and operations.

But as in the stress of real battle, though different nations and modes of fight may find themselves on the same field, needs must there shall be one leader, and one plan of attack or defence—as in the imminent danger time-honoured institutions give way before the mode of the majority—so, it seems to us, is Rome not unlikely to carry her way, and be recognized as the army which is to resist the march of modern thought; that within her may be absorbed all of Catholicism, however widely parts of it may now seem opposed; or at all events that such will be the line of events in this our western Christendom.

If such crisis shall come, or even as there shall seem to be a tendency towards it, there will be, there is, a difficulty which we must face. Our intellectual life, our sympathies, our hopes, are with the new—our devotional life is nourished by the old. We must face the fact that liberal men of many churches may be cast out, creedless and homeless, before the day come when fact and belief shall be in perfect harmony, the intellect and the feelings altogether reconciled. It will be hard to bear if such an alternative shall be presented, yet looking forward to its possibility renders it easier; and there is less danger of our doing as some have done,—dare to walk with Freedom a little way—then, fearful of the stormy wild through which they needs must pass before they gain the settled seat of peace, turn back to hide their shivering spirits in the mantle of her who sits upon the Seven Hills.

We have learnt lessons from Edward Irving and his Church quite other than he or they would teach us. We find ourselves in different camps, and the words which are the weapons on either side are sometimes edged, and smite hard. But when the battle is done, and the wider policy is seen, which brought about divisions,—when the land of peace is gained, those are none the worse, but rather the better friends, who remember that once they strove for what they thought the righteous cause, foot to foot and sword to sword.

C. KEGAN PAUL.

VI.—UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

A MOTION, made by an Irish Member at the close of the last Parliamentary session, and which received little and rather slighting notice at the time, has raised some issues, both practical and theoretical, in the province of education, of very grave importance. The motion was a demand for a Charter for a Roman Catholic College established some twelve years ago in Dublin, and commonly known as "The Catholic University," though hitherto without the power of granting degrees. It was met on the part of the Government by a counter proposal, to the effect, that, instead of

constituting a new University in Ireland by the grant of a charter, the Catholic establishment should be affiliated as a distinct college on one of the universities which now exist, to wit, the Queen's. This compromise was eagerly embraced by the mover, and in general by the representatives of the Catholic party in Parliament, Mr. Hennessy being the single dissident. The precise form which the Government scheme is destined to take is not yet known; but it has been shadowed forth in a series of announcements which purport to be authoritative, and which—as they proceed from the section of Catholics whom the concession is designed to conciliate, and who have certainly through their leaders been in communication with the Government—may be assumed to embody, with more or less exactitude, the principal features of the pending arrangement; and the prospect has elicited a discussion which at all events exhibits very clearly the hopes and fears of the supporters and opponents of the proposed change. These hopes and fears alike point to the same result—a re-modelling of the liberal and “mixed” system of State education hitherto maintained in Ireland in a denominational, which in the present instance means an ultramontane, sense—to a direct reversal therefore of the policy pursued in that country for the last thirty years. When we add that the controversy has brought up, in a practical shape, some of the nicest and most perplexing problems regarding the relations of the State to education, it will be seen that the occurrence is highly deserving of attentive study, whether we regard its bearing on the welfare of Ireland or on the prospects of educational progress.

We shall perhaps best introduce the reader to this controversy by a brief narrative of what has been done in recent years in promoting that department of education in Ireland which is the subject of the present discussion. Down to 1845, Trinity College, with the Dublin University, formed the only provision made for the higher secular learning in Ireland. Founded in the reign of Queen Elizabeth for the purpose of promoting the Protestant religion, its constitution and character were suitable to the circumstances of its origin. We shall perhaps convey a sufficiently precise notion for our present purpose of this establishment, if we say that it belongs, with many differences in detail, to the same order of educational bodies of which Oxford and Cambridge

are the type in this country. It was of course inevitable that, as originally constituted, its basis should be rigidly sectarian ; every religious denomination, but that established by law, was excluded alike from its degrees and its emoluments. But towards the end of the last century, under the influence of the more liberal ideas which then began to prevail, Trinity College opened its doors to Roman Catholics for admission to degrees ; and a succession of measures, introduced at intervals from that period, and conceived in a spirit of consistent liberality, has placed it now in a position very decidedly in advance, in point of comprehensiveness and national character, of either of our ancient universities ; Roman Catholics and Dissenters being now freely admitted to all its degrees, except those of divinity, to its senate and parliamentary constituency, and to a large share of its emoluments. In spite, however, of these substantial reforms, it would scarcely, we should imagine, be maintained by any candid Churchman, that Trinity College—retaining, as it still did, its essentially Protestant character, its Protestant traditions, and still excluding all but Protestants from its higher distinctions—formed an adequate provision for the higher education in a country of which three-fourths of the population were Roman Catholics. This was the view taken by a Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed in 1835, of which the late Sir Thomas Wyse was chairman. Among other recommendations of this Committee was one for the establishment of four colleges, one in each of the provinces of Ireland, which should extend to that portion of the people not already provided for in the National Schools the opportunity of an education, to borrow the language of the Report, “of the most improved character,” “general, common to all, without distinction of class or creed.” The policy advocated in the Report was adopted by the Government of Sir Robert Peel. It was determined to supplement the Elizabethan university by institutions conceived in the spirit of modern times, and directed to promote the interests of all classes of the community. In 1845, two measures were introduced ; one for the re-constitution of Maynooth on an independent footing, and with a liberal endowment, as a seminary for the Roman Catholic priesthood ; and the other for the establishment, in the interest of the laity, of three provincial colleges in

Belfast, Cork and Galway, constituted on the principle of strict religious equality, and designed to attract the various religious denominations to receive there an education in common: in the words of Sir James Graham, in the speech in which he introduced the measure, "The new Collegiate System was avowedly an extension, and nothing more than an extension, of the present system of National Education"—[that system established in 1831 on the basis of "combined secular and separate religious instruction," and which had already, in 1845, achieved a remarkable success]—"from the children of the humblest to the children of the upper and middle classes."

Such was the origin of the Queen's Colleges: they were opened in 1849; and in 1850, in conformity with the original conception of the scheme, the Charter was granted by which the Queen's University was founded. In the words of the Charter, its object was "to render complete and satisfactory the courses of education to be followed by students in the said Colleges," and with a view to this, to invest it with the power "of granting all such degrees as are granted by other Universities or Colleges to students who shall have completed in any one or other of the Colleges the courses of education prescribed and directed for the several degrees:"—the University was thus the natural completion and crown of the collegiate edifice. We need only further say, as regards this part of the case, that, while considerable powers were assigned to the local Colleges, the general government of the central institution, including the fixing of the courses of study for degrees and the appointment of University examiners, was placed with the Chancellor and Senate of the Queen's University.

And now we would ask the reader's attention to an important part of this story—the attitude assumed by the Roman Catholic community towards the new institutions. It was the expectation of the Government of that day—surely not an unreasonable one, considering the essential fairness, and, account being taken of the grant to Maynooth, even liberality, of the arrangement, and further that the scheme was but an extension to the higher education of that plan which had already in the primary schools of the National System been received amongst Roman Catholics with all but universal favour—that the Queen's Colleges and their University would have been accepted by priest

and people in the spirit in which they were offered. And for a brief moment there was every prospect that this expectation would be realized in the fullest sense. Doctors Murray and Croly occupied then, as Archbishop of Dublin and Primate, the highest places in the Irish Roman Catholic Church: they had both from the first accepted with cordial loyalty the principle of the National System, which they had aided in working, and the success of which was largely due to their enlightened efforts. They were now, with other leading members of the hierarchy, in communication with the Government on the subject of the Queen's Colleges. With such negotiators the Government had no difficulty in coming to an understanding. The statutes were drawn up, submitted to their inspection, and approved. It was admitted that the securities provided for the protection of "faith and morals" were ample. It will probably sound strange to many people now that amongst the names of the original members of the Queen's University Senate the third in order is that of Daniel Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. The priesthood, indeed, were not unanimous: there was an active dissentient minority; but looking to the influence then exercised by Doctors Murray and Croly, one can hardly doubt that a few more years of their gentle and enlightened rule would have carried with them in support of the Colleges, as it had already carried with them in support of the National Schools, the great body of the priesthood. Most unfortunately for peace and educational progress in Ireland, just at this time—the same year in which the Queen's Colleges were opened—Dr. Croly died; and he was followed, two years later, by his abler coadjutor. The successor to each was Dr. Cullen, who, appointed in the first instance to the See of Armagh—through a stretch of papal authority exercised in defiance of the immemorial usage of the Irish Church, according to which the *dignissimus* of those recommended for the honour by the clergy of the diocese is selected—was, on the death of Murray, transferred to Dublin. Dr. Cullen's preparation for the post he was now called to fill had been a sojourn of some thirty years in Rome, where, in the capacity of Director of the Irish Department of the Papal Government, he had made himself conspicuous as a zealous supporter of all the extremest pretensions of the ecclesiastical party. It was indeed avowedly to advance the aims of ultramontane policy

that he was sent to Ireland, the better to equip him for which service he was furnished with the further authority and distinction of Apostolic Delegate. Dr. Cullen had scarcely entered on his mission, when, we must own with true instinct, he laid his hand upon the State system of mixed education, as presenting the most formidable obstacle to his aims. He at once denounced it, alike in the higher and the primary department; and—the Queen's Colleges then just opened, and still struggling with the difficulties of a *début* made in the face of much carefully prepared odium—one of his first acts was to summon the Synod of Thurles for the express purpose of condemning them. As all the world knows, the Colleges were condemned; but it is a noteworthy fact—as shewing how entirely the course which the Roman Catholic clergy have since followed has been due to the foreign influences imported by Dr. Cullen into the Irish Church—that the condemnation was only carried by a majority of one; not only this, but—what may not be so well known—even this slender triumph was obtained by questionable means—through an accident improved by an artifice. During the sitting of the Synod, a bishop, known to be favourable to the Colleges, fell sick: his place was at once filled by Dr. Cullen with a delegate of opposite views; the sick bishop recovered; but it was not deemed advisable to restore him to his place till the vote on the Colleges had been taken. The Queen's Colleges were thus condemned; and the next step was to start a rival in the same field. For this purpose an apostolic brief was obtained, addressed to “the bishops of Ireland,” authorizing and directing them to found a “Catholic University.” Ere the Synod of Thurles had separated, a Committee was appointed, consisting of eight bishops, eight priests, and eight laymen (all of course Roman Catholics), to whose charge the organization and government of the projected institution was entrusted. Under these auspices appeared in due time in the middle of the nineteenth century “The Catholic University of Ireland,” established, in the admiring language of its accomplished advocate, on “the eternal principles which regulated the relations of the Catholic Universities of the Middle Ages.”*

* *Two Articles on Education*, by Myles W. O'Reilly, B.A., LL.D., M.P. (reprinted from the *Dublin Review*), p. 53.

From the sitting of the Synod of Thurles dates the systematic opposition of the Roman Catholic priesthood to the plan of mixed education in Ireland; and from this point, or rather from the elevation of Dr. Cullen, dates also a new policy in ecclesiastical patronage in Ireland, under which, within twenty years, a complete change has been effected in the character of the Irish Roman Catholic priesthood. In 1848, the spirit of that organization was, with few exceptions, national: under the rule of Dr. Cullen it has become, except in the ranks of the lower clergy, an almost purely ultramontane body, absolutely devoted to ideas of which Rome, and not Ireland, is the originating source.

The Roman Catholic priesthood had condemned the Colleges. We have yet to ascertain how they were regarded by the Roman Catholic people. Now this is manifestly a point of great importance in connection with our present theme. For if the Colleges have failed—or even though they should not have failed utterly, if they have failed as regards the section of the Irish people for whom they were principally intended—the Roman Catholics—then, *solvuntur tabulae*, whatever may have been the benevolent views of the founders, or the abstract excellence of the scheme, there is no reason that they should be a moment longer maintained: by all means let the advice of Major O'Reilly be adopted, that the officials be pensioned off and the buildings sold. But if, on the other hand, the Colleges have in fact succeeded, if provision has by their means been effectually made for training in the higher learning those of the Irish people—not already provided for by Trinity College—for whom (regard being had to their social position) such training is suitable—provision, too, accordant to their wants and feelings—then, whatever the advocates of change may have to say for themselves on grounds of theory, there is at least no substantial grievance to be remedied; and the question for statesmen in this discussion is not of supplying a felt need—of “filling a gap (to borrow Mr. Gladstone's phrase) in university education in Ireland”—but of remodelling, with a view to improvement, a system already practically effective. To the importance of this point ultramontane advocates have shewn themselves fully alive, so far as this can be shewn

by invariably assuming it in their own favour. According to them, "the Queen's Colleges have wholly failed," while "The Catholic University" is in an eminently successful position."* They have not in general offered any reasons for these assertions. But, of course, when a demand was made to Parliament to reverse the policy it had followed for thirty years, it became necessary to sustain the allegation of failure with some show of proof. This task was accordingly undertaken by the O'Donoghue—the mover of the resolution to which we referred at the opening of these remarks. That gentleman produced on that occasion certain statistics from which he drew the desired conclusion. Strange to say, the O'Donoghue's reasons were never traversed by the Government, though directly at variance with the repeated assertions of successive Lord Lieutenants and Chief Secretaries of Ireland, members of the then administration. But since the parliamentary debate considerable light has been thrown upon this question from other quarters. Those interested on the side of the Colleges have supplied the answer which the Government, for whatever reasons, declined to give, and the whole case may now be regarded as pretty fully before the public. We shall endeavour to state briefly how the facts in reference to this important matter stand.

The case for the failure of the Queen's Colleges as presented by the O'Donoghue was briefly this:—The total number of students in Trinity College he set down (we know not on what authority) at..... 1000
The total number in the Queen's Colleges at..... 837

Giving an aggregate receiving education in both of... 1837
Of the 1000 students in Trinity College, but 45 were Roman Catholics: of the 837 in the Queen's Colleges but 223; that is to say, 268 Roman Catholics altogether as against 1569 Protestants, in an aggregate of 1837, or 14 per cent. With this state of facts he contrasted certain returns of attendance in intermediate schools, from which it appeared that the Roman Catholics and Protestants receiving education in these were about equal in number. His inference was—an inference adopted by the Government—that the

* *Two Articles on Education*, pp. 46, 78.

Roman Catholics were deterred from going on to the higher education by conscientious objections to the institutions through which it was provided. On these grounds he demanded a charter for "The Catholic University."

The reply on the part of the Colleges has been as follows : Accepting the facts so far as they are given, they do not sustain the O'Donoghue's conclusion. For why is it to be assumed that the relative numbers of Roman Catholics and Protestants in the intermediate schools furnish a just basis for a comparison of their numbers in the Universities ? Are there not in every population large numbers who avail themselves of the education afforded in intermediate schools who never think of prosecuting their studies further ? and is it not possible that this class may be larger among Irish Roman Catholics than among Irish Protestants ? Notoriously this is the fact. The discrepancy therefore between the comparative returns of the intermediate schools and those of the Universities finds in part an obvious explanation in the social condition of the two classes. But, secondly, it finds a further explanation in a still graver flaw in the O'Donoghue's argument, a flaw so grave as in fact to vitiate it altogether—the entire omission of the principal element of the returns on the Catholic side. The Protestant students are set down at 1569—a number which includes, besides students intended for the several lay callings, the great bulk of those designed for holy orders in the several Protestant Churches ; but the 268 Roman Catholics who are contrasted with them comprise *lay students only*. For the education of the Roman Catholics intended for the priesthood the State has provided Maynooth with an endowment of £26,000 a year ; and besides Maynooth, several other colleges exist in Ireland maintained from private sources for a similar purpose.* The students attending these, and who have

* "Of seminaries for the education of ecclesiastics in 1800, Maynooth, which had existed just five years, was the only one ; in 1864, besides the national seminary of Maynooth, which has now an annual endowment of £26,000, and numbers 500 students, our bishops have also established seventeen diocesan seminaries ; and in addition to these institutions for the education of the priesthood, several of the religious orders have houses in Ireland where their members are educated for the priesthood : such are the Calced Carmelites, Dominicans, Augustinians, Cistercians, Jesuits, Vincentians, Passionists, Redemptorists, and Oblates of Mary."—*Progress of Catholicity in Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* : a Paper read before the Catholic Congress of Mechlin, Sept. 1864, by Myles O'Reilly, LL.D., M.P., pp. 15, 16.

their counterpart on the Protestant side in the divinity classes of Dublin and Belfast included in the quoted figures, the O'Donoghue wholly omits ! It illustrates curiously the spirit in which this gentleman's argument was encountered by the Government, that in the discussion which ensued this huge and glaring omission was never detected. It has, however, since been both detected and supplied by less complaisant disputants. As corrected, the comparison stands thus :

Protestant students, lay and clerical, receiving the	
higher education.....	1569
Roman Catholic, ditto ditto.....	1155

We think it must be allowed that this considerably alters the aspect of the case. But the consideration remains : does the number of Roman Catholic students, thus enlarged, fairly represent the proportion of the body who would in the present social condition of Ireland naturally aspire to an academic *status* ? Now on this point an accurate criterion is plainly not attainable ; but such facts as the following will serve to give the reader an approximately correct idea as to how the matter stands. It appears* that in an aggregate of 6483 members composing the learned professions in Ireland, the Roman Catholic proportion is 2219, or 33 per cent. : in the aggregate magistracy Roman Catholics stand for 24 per cent. ; amongst those returned in the census as " ladies and gentlemen," for 27 per cent. These facts, we say, do not afford an accurate measure of the comparative need amongst Roman Catholics for University education ; but they furnish an approximate standard, which taken in connection with the statistics of the higher education just given, justifies us, we think, in asserting that, as regards this department of instruction, Roman Catholics in Ireland are already not badly provided for.

It would seem, then, that " the gap " in university education in Ireland has yet to be discovered : in plain terms, there is not a tittle of evidence to shew that any appreciable proportion of Irish Roman Catholics are by conscientious objections, or by any other cause than their social position and circumstances, excluded from the existing Irish universities. Let us now add to the presumptive proof of what has

* See the Table of the Census setting forth the " occupations " of the population.

not been omitted, the positive evidence of what has been performed. Omitting details, then, the general results accomplished by the Queen's University and its Colleges in a career of fifteen years are these: they have in that time educated 3330 Irishmen, that is to say, 957 members of the Established Church, 938 Roman Catholics, 1197 Presbyterians, and 238 of other denominations. They are at the present moment educating more than at any previous time; their students now being within one-fifth as numerous as those of Trinity College, Dublin, and within one-third as numerous as those of the University of Oxford. In a period of fourteen years, the Queen's University has conferred 845 degrees (exclusive of diplomas and *ad eundems*); the number conferred by the London University during the corresponding period of its career being 954, or about 11 per cent. more. The Colleges have since their establishment trebled the number of Roman Catholic laymen receiving university education.* The quality of their education, as shewn by every available test, is not inferior to that obtainable in any of the older universities. Lastly, they have eminently succeeded in what was a leading object of their establishment—the bringing together in the same class-rooms of students from all the various religious bodies in the country.

We have been anxious to dispose of the questions of failure and practical grievance before engaging in the discussion of the projects of university reform, which the announcement by the Government that they were prepared to concede some modification of the existing system has naturally brought upon the carpet. The course of the controversy has already disclosed the fact, that the ideas of those who criticise the present arrangements do not run in a

* At p. 47 of Major O'Reilly's pamphlet, the following passage occurs: "On the other hand, the recognized authorities of the Catholic Church would decide, with judgment and prudence, what changes were necessary to remove the objections which prevent Catholics attending Cork College." Considering that, when this was written, there were 123 Catholics on the rolls as attending Cork College—a fact with which Major O'Reilly would surely not have failed to acquaint himself—we are driven to suppose that that gentleman refuses the name of "Catholics" to those who attend a Queen's College. In this he may or may not be justified; but it seems to us that it would have been only fair, before adopting this course, to have apprized his readers of this his habit. We call attention to the circumstance, because it may furnish a clue to his meaning, and possibly to the meaning of others who share his opinions, when they assure us that "the Queen's Colleges have wholly failed."

single channel. Under the assumed banner of "freedom of education," two distinct, and to some extent conflicting, policies are advocated; one of these, that of the ultramontane party proper, aims avowedly (its liberal watchword notwithstanding) at the erection of "The Catholic University"—an institution, it will be remembered, established at the instigation of the Pope, and now worked through a committee of which two-thirds are Roman Catholic ecclesiastics—into a position of paramount and pervading authority over the whole higher education of Roman Catholics in Ireland; the other—whatever may be our judgment on its general merits—would seem at least to be conceived with a *bona-fide* desire to promote educational freedom according to the ideas of those who support it. We are even disposed to suspect that its advocates (who, we may observe, though Roman Catholics, are laymen) have, consciously or unconsciously, not been uninfluenced by a desire to counteract the aims of the *parti prêtre*; though, we own, we have been led to this conclusion, more from the violence with which the policy in question has been assailed by that party, than from anything that we can discover in the proposals put forward calculated to offer an effectual obstruction to their designs. However this may be, our object now is to place before our readers each of these schemes of educational reform, so far as we have been able to collect them from the manifestos of the two sections, and, without reference to a possible *arrière pensée*, to endeavour to estimate, as correctly as we are able, their real character and tendency.

Taking, first, what for distinction we may describe as the *lay* proposal, its leading idea would seem to be to remodel the existing institutions for the higher education in Ireland, on the pattern presented by the London University and the various seminaries which prepare candidates for its degrees. The adoption of the principle in its integrity would require the abolition of both the present Irish universities: on their ruins would be raised a new university, to be called the University of Dublin or of Ireland, which would be in fact simply an examining Board, under which would be ranged as strictly co-ordinate institutions the various teaching bodies of the country, including amongst these as equal members Trinity College, the Queen's Colleges, St. Patrick's

College, Maynooth, "The Catholic University," &c. These would send up candidates for matriculation and degrees to the central institution, where, without reference to the antecedents of their training, they would be received, examined and certificated. But this scheme, though "comprehensive, well-founded in theory, and national in aspect,"* it is thought advisable, from considerations of practical expediency, suggested by the opposition which it would be in the power of Trinity College to offer, to relinquish, in favour of another less perfect but more feasible. It is accordingly proposed to leave Dublin University with its College aside as refractory elements, but to throw the remaining educational institutions of the country into the crucible. The connection between the Queen's University and its Colleges would be dissolved; the University in its present character would cease to exist; and the outcome would be an examining Board, to be named the Queen's University, and a group of co-ordinate institutions, amongst which the Queen's Colleges, Maynooth College and "The Catholic University" would rank with others. These would work together on an equal footing, engaged in the common task of preparing candidates for the matriculation and degree examinations to be held by the Central Board.

Such in outline is the scheme which has been propounded, and which enjoys, we understand, in Ireland a certain amount of favour. It is also a part of the proposal that the Senate of the University should be increased from sixteen (the present number) to thirty members,—twenty of these to be nominated by the Crown and to consist in equal numbers of Protestants and Catholics, the remaining ten to be elected by Convocation. Further, it is proposed that the appointment of Professors in the Queen's Colleges should be transferred from the Crown to a local Board, constituted on a plan, as it seems to us, equally complicated and unpromising. For the present, however, we purpose confining ourselves to the more fundamental and characteristic features of the scheme.

* "University Education in Ireland," p. 8. This pamphlet, by a distinguished member of the Queen's University Senate, and which we take as the best exposition of the views we are now considering, has not been published; but as it has enjoyed a very large circulation, probably much larger than if it made its appearance in the ordinary way, we do not think that, in treating it as public, we violate any rule of literary etiquette which deserves to be held sacred.

And in the first place, it occurs to us to ask, why, supposing it is proper to abolish one or both of the existing Irish universities, erect another in their room? According to the theory propounded, the proper function of a university is to test actual acquirement, without reference to the place or mode of acquisition. A university is thus conceived as a sort of intellectual mint to which all the pure metal of knowledge in the country is to be brought to receive the stamp which is to make it current. Well, adopting this view, is there not already the London University to perform the required office? It is not denied that it performs its office well: on what principle, then, are we required to establish a second mint for knowledge, and thus to introduce into the economy of letters double standards and measures? The writer who has advocated this plan takes the "Jury Central" of Belgium (the exact position of which in the Belgium scheme of education, by the way, he seems to us to misconceive) as the model of a national university; and he tells us that the London University is in this country the analogue of that institution. Then why not act on this analogy, and re-organize the "unharnessed" Irish seminaries under the London "Central"? It cannot be said that local convenience would require a second Irish university; for, as this writer has himself shewn, by a recent arrangement the officers of the metropolitan establishment are brought to the doors of the Irish Colleges. Nor can we suppose—at a time when the mischief of keeping alive a distinct national sentiment is just receiving such painful illustration, when even to the Irish Lord Lieutenancy everything which looks in this direction is carefully discountenanced—that an Irish "Central" will be demanded on *national* grounds. It seems to us, therefore, that the leading feature of the scheme stands condemned upon its author's own principles. The present universities of Ireland, *constituted as they now are*, may have something to say for themselves: how far this is so we shall presently examine: an Irish university constituted on the plan proposed, as a second "Jury Central," would be absolutely without a reason for its existence. Nay, there would be abundance of reasons for its non-existence; for what other effect could the creation of such a body have than to introduce between it and the university already in possession of the field a vicious

competition for candidates, such as this writer himself, in the case of the medical schools, has shewn almost necessarily results in a degradation of the standard of knowledge?

But the policy of the scheme we have described is open to objections more fundamental far than this. What is the conception of education which it presents to us? Simply that of a preparatory process for a uniform examination. For culture properly so called, for the process by which the mind is opened, liberated and rendered productive, for any results which may not be tested by categorical question and answer, the scheme we have described makes no provision: nay, there are abundant indications that these objects lie absolutely outside its author's mental horizon. It is laid down, for example, that universities should "test the man for what he knows, not where he learned it," apparently under the impression that the object of restricting University degrees to those trained in particular institutions is to create a "monopoly" in favour of the institutions, or the localities where they happen to exist. The same view is almost grotesquely brought out in another passage:

"The student of St. Patrick's College, Carlow, passes through Dublin, where the Queen's University ignores him, on his way to the London University, which admits him—surely such an absurdity cannot be permitted to continue."

We do not know whether the fact that the student of St. Patrick's College, Carlow, can now obtain his degree from London University *without* passing the site of the Queen's University, will diminish in our author's eyes the absurdity which he here discovers; but to our minds the only absurdity in the case—and it is a very great absurdity—is the application of such tests to such subjects.

In presence of arguments of this order, it may perhaps be well to state that the end of a University system—the purpose by success or failure in which it must be justified or condemned—is not to bring aspirants to academic degrees by the shortest route before the nearest examining Board, much as criminals are hurried before the nearest Justice, but to furnish the means for the largest, freest, and most varied development of the human faculties. Now this is not to be accomplished by a system which proposes no other aim, and provides for no other result, than success at an examination, a system which converts the entire educational

machinery of a country into an apparatus for encouraging and facilitating "cram." We are not amongst those who regard with anything but unmixed satisfaction the application in recent years of the method of competitive examination to the public service. Employed within certain limits, and applied with discretion, it is, we believe, an invaluable expedient in working the machinery of administration. But the method obviously, admittedly, has a tendency to engender certain well-known intellectual defects, of which the chief is the habit of loading the memory with the mere results of knowledge rapidly accumulated, and, when the pressure is passed, almost as rapidly forgotten. Nor will it be denied that the evil is one which many other modern influences powerfully contribute to foster. This being so, it would seem to be the part of wisdom so to frame our educational arrangements as to neutralize as far as possible this besetting tendency. One obvious means—we own, so far as we can see, the only effectual means—of accomplishing this object is to supplement the examination test by others; for example, by the condition that the student, before presenting himself for examination, shall have gone through certain prescribed courses of study under the guidance of the best minds which the teaching body of the age can furnish. This is what the academic or collegiate system* seeks to do, and what, with more or less success, it accomplishes; and this is the condition which the plan we are considering proposes altogether to annul. Under the notion that it is placing all localities on a par, that it is excluding the element "where" from the conditions of the acquisition of knowledge, it in fact places all methods of instruction on a par, and excludes from the conditions required as evidence of knowledge that one which forms the chief and almost the only security for its thoroughness. Far from providing checks against the prevailing intellectual vice of the time, it makes a clean sweep of such inadequate securities as now exist, and even invites the advances of the enemy by opening to his ambition a new and boundless field.

* We may explain here, to avoid misapprehension, that by the "collegiate system," we merely mean instruction carried out through regular attendance on courses of lectures delivered in institutions established for the purpose of general mental cultivation. This necessarily implies residence near a college, but not necessarily menial residence.

But perhaps we shall be told that these consequences are not involved in the proposed scheme. The plan—so we can imagine an advocate might put the argument—far from favouring any scheme of instruction in particular, is essentially neutral as amongst all, and neither seeks, on the one hand, to discourage the system of collegiate training, nor, on the other, to promote private teaching. People under the new *régime*, it might be said, might continue, if they thought proper, to send their sons to colleges as now; and no doubt (such a reasoner might add), if the advantages of this course are as great as is pretended, this is what would happen. The essence of the scheme, in short, it might be urged, is not protection or favour, but freedom—the extension into the field of knowledge of that stimulus to effort and improvement which healthy competition supplies—in a word, “free trade in education.”

But this, however plausible, is, in reality, wholly irrelevant to the issue which we have raised. Our objection to the proposed scheme is, not that it applies the examination test unfairly, but that *it applies no other test*. If the condition of passing an examination be the only one required by a university for obtaining its degrees, it is plain that the qualities of education which an examination is competent to elicit are the only ones which such a university will tend to develop. The Central Board of Examination would, no doubt, be perfectly impartial as between the various systems of which the results would be submitted to it; but if its tests are only fitted for the discovery of merit of a certain kind, it could not but favour the systems which were most efficacious in producing that sort of merit. But we need not on this point rely altogether on speculative considerations. We have already had tolerably large experience of the working of such a system in the examinations for the Indian Civil Service. These examinations are probably conducted in a manner as well fitted to defeat “cram” as in the nature of the case is possible; and what is the lesson which the experiment teaches? We believe it is this, that in such a contest the places of education in which collegiate training is enforced are not competent to hold their ground against the competition of the professional “coach.” Unfortunately it is not possible to exhibit the results of the experiment in statistical form; as it is the custom of the

Civil Service Commissioners to ignore in their returns the places of special instruction, in which the majority of the candidates spend two or three years before presenting themselves for examination. The effect of this, of course, is that the work of the professional trainers is concealed; the universities and schools obtaining credit largely for successes which are in fact due to other means of instruction. The working of the system, therefore, as regards the point in hand, cannot be exhibited statistically. We will, however, quote the opinion of a friend who, with the advantage of some experience as an examiner, has watched the experiment. "My own opinion," he writes, "is that university candidates are declining and must decline in numbers; the Indian Civil Service examinations are making a sort of university themselves. A lad of 16 or 17 goes to a 'coach,' and at the end of a year goes in to the examination to see what it is like; he thus feels his way, ascertains his weak points, and has some means of judging whether he may be successful in a second or third venture; and it constantly happens that a selected candidate has been up once, if not twice, before. The Civil Service Halls, Institutes and what not, are thus in the same relation to the Indian Civil Service examination that the affiliated Colleges of London University are to it. It is quite impossible that the older Universities can compete with this system." Such, in the opinion of careful observers, is the tendency of competitive examination in relation to collegiate training in the most important instance in which it has yet been tried; and this may enable us to form an idea of what would be the result of remodelling our entire university system on the plan of the Civil Service Commission, which is in effect the reform now proposed. It could only, as it seems to us, discourage, and ultimately lead to the abandonment altogether in the higher education of systematic training in colleges,—the one effectual safeguard which we possess against the gravest intellectual danger of the time. The older universities might, under such a *régime*, for a time hold their ground: their *prestige* would not at once perish. But for places like the Irish Queen's Colleges,—institutions of yesterday—institutions which, far from being aided by *prestige*, have had to struggle against a weight of disingenuous misrepresentation

and carefully fostered odium,—the result of such a policy could only be quick destruction.*

Nor would the mischief of this movement be confined to its intellectual consequences. With the collegiate system would also be lost advantages of a moral and social kind, scarcely, if at all, less important than its more direct and palpable benefits—those manifold helps to the formation of character which arise from bringing young men together at the most impressionable period of life, and placing them under the influence of minds not unsympathetic with theirs, while instructed and mature. In the friendly intimacies and honourable rivalries of those three or four years, what opportunities occur for lessons in the practical ethics of life!—lessons at once in modesty and self-respect, laid silently to heart as the student measures himself against his fellows, and ascertains his true mental stature—lessons in candour and toleration as he discovers how most questions have two sides, on either of which good and earnest men are found to range themselves—lessons in the practical value and skilful handling of the truths learned in the lecture-room, afforded by conversation with his companions and by the opportunities of the debating club;—lastly, lessons in self-reliance, simplicity and manliness of character, inhaled with the moral atmosphere of a place in which the only distinctions known are those which in the actual arena have made their pretensions good.

These are advantages incidental to the Collegiate system wherever it is established; but for a country like Ireland, long torn with religious dissensions, where for centuries Protestants and Catholics educated in opposite camps have learned to regard each other almost as natural enemies, the system, carried out as it is in the Queen's Colleges, has manifestly a special adaptation. What can be better fitted to qualify the virus of bigotry and engender feelings of mutual

* We are inclined, on consideration, to think that it would prove even more certainly the destruction of "The Catholic University." Over and above the causes indicated, which would affect this institution (as it also enforces the collegiate principle) equally with the Queen's Colleges, there would be the desire to escape ecclesiastical dictation. To the plea of poverty with which the recommendation of the priesthood to parents to send their sons to "The Catholic University" could easily be met, there would be no effective reply. Hence, no doubt, the strenuous repudiation by the clerical party of this lay scheme.

consideration and respect, what better preparation for the duties of citizenship in a country of mixed religious faith can be imagined, than a system of education which furnishes to the youths of all religious denominations neutral ground on which they may meet and cultivate in common, without reference to the causes which divide them, those pursuits in which they have a common interest? It is a noteworthy fact, and one for which, let us observe in passing, the authorities in those institutions deserve some little credit, that throughout the fifteen years of their existence, with one single and transient exception,* not an instance in any of the Colleges has occurred of dissension due to religious differences. And this result has been attained, while religious controversy has been raging with the utmost fury all around, and while propagandist societies—in the case of one of the colleges at least, and that one in which Catholics and Protestants meet in almost exactly equal numbers—have been pushing their operations almost at the College doors. Yet, in spite of these provocatives to discord, Catholics and Protestants have left those institutions, and are leaving them year by year, having there formed friendships which will last with their lives. These are achievements to which the academic system, as carried out in Ireland through the Queen's Colleges, may point with pride; and they are such as, it seems to us, no wise Government would lightly imperil or willingly let die.†

* On one occasion some students, at a visitation of Belfast College, raised "the Kentish fire." The incident has, we believe, been much exaggerated; at all events, it was unique. There was a fine illustration of the habitual spirit of the place at a recent very numerous meeting of the graduates to protest against the proposed changes in the University. Each of the speakers referred to the advantage he had derived from mixing with men of different creeds, but the tone of the remarks, and the patient attention with which the assembly listened to a solitary dissenter, were better evidence of their tolerance than any direct testimony.

† One objection to the enforcement of residence in the Queen's Colleges might be, and indeed has been, urged with much apparent force—that it is unsuited to a poor population. So serious did this consideration seem to the Commissioners who reported on the state of Trinity College in 1852, that, while expressing in the strongest terms the value they attached to academic residence, they yet declined to recommend that it should be made indispensable. Fortunately, the advocates of the collegiate system are now enabled to meet this reasonable apprehension with the most satisfactory of answers—the fact of success. In spite of the rule of residence, the Queen's Colleges, as has been seen, have attracted to their halls quite as large a proportion of the several classes as the social circumstances of the country give warrant for expecting.

The writer, indeed, whose scheme of university reform we have been criticising, is, as one would expect, sceptical of these advantages. He tells us : " It is held that the intimacies and associations thus formed may be, and indeed often are, as much for evil as for good, when young men or boys are sent for three years away from guardians and parents. Studious and well-disposed young men do not obtrude their advice or example on their companions ; the idle and ill-disposed are always obtrusive, and their persuasions and example often exercise a most injurious influence over their companions." Now we have no hesitation in repudiating this representation, which we can scarcely believe to be the reflex of an actual experience, as a fair account of the influences evolved amid the intercourse of undergraduate life. At least, speaking from our own experience, self-distrust and morbid reserve are not the characteristics which we remember to have observed in the men who took the highest places in the honour lists and the foremost parts in the debating club. Of course, where many youths congregate, there will be " studious and well-disposed young men " whose virtue will seek the shade, and " idle and ill-disposed " who will thrust themselves into the foreground ; but these, we submit, are not the prevailing types. Self-assertion, rather than morbid shyness, is the side on which we venture to think youthful merit, intellectual and moral, is apt to err ; and it would speak little indeed for the administrative adroitness of those who bear rule in collegiate circles, if this natural proneness of the best minds under their authority to impress themselves on all who come within their range, were not turned to account in generating a public opinion favourable to virtue and honourable distinction. As a matter of fact, we believe that this result is generally attained. In the great academic bodies of the country, undergraduate opinion is, we venture to say, in the main healthy and sound. If it is not invariably so, the exceptional result is, doubtless, due to an exceptional cause ; to something, we should conjecture, radically wrong in the constitution of the bodies which yield the noxious fruits. The fact, if it be one, ought not to be blinked ; but its proper moral is, not the abolition of the academic system in education, but the reformation of the peccant institutions.

As we have ventured to impugn the theory of university

reform advanced in the proposal we have been examining, it may perhaps be expected that we should indicate, in lieu of the principle we have combated, what in our opinion is the sound ideal of a university system. Reverting, then, to what we said a few pages back, that the true end of universities is to provide means for the largest and freest development in all directions of the national mind, and remembering that culture implies systematic training, and that distinct forms of culture imply distinct and independent institutions, a perfect system for the higher education would, in our opinion, be one in which university degrees should represent, not a mere quantum of uniform attainment, but, along with knowledge, types of culture ; and in which the number of distinct universities should correspond with the number of distinct types of culture which mental movement in that country might assume. Of course it would be necessary in practice to restrict the application of this principle to those forms of mental movement which were sufficiently characteristic, and at the same time the expression of the intellectual condition of a sufficiently large number of persons, to make the establishment of independent institutions for their promotion worth the while. And it would also be necessary, in order to the complete freedom of education,—inasmuch as there are in all communities persons who, whether from narrowness of means, mental idiosyncrasy, or from other causes, decline to take part in the collegiate system through which alone types of culture can be generated and maintained—that the universities, constituted on the plan indicated of representing culture, should be supplemented by a university constituted upon that of representing attainment merely ; or, to state our meaning in concrete language, that, in addition to universities of the Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin type, there should be a university also of the London type. There is no reason that persons, unable or unwilling to take part in the collegiate system, on giving proof that they have acquired a due amount of knowledge, should not be admitted to the intellectual rank of university-educated men ; and the natural and obvious means of effecting this object would be through a university in which the collegiate condition was not imperative. Such a system, it seems to us, would realize the conditions requisite at once for the

freedom and the solidity of mental progress ; and in fact it is a system of this kind at which in the natural course of things—practice in this instance as in others preceding theory—we have arrived in this country. Under the impulse of particular motives, with slight regard to general views, the founders of our universities, whether private individuals or governments, have laid the foundation of an organization in the higher learning, which, in its actual condition, does not differ materially from that which would have been realized if the principles we have indicated had been deliberately followed. We have not one, but many universities, which in the main represent specific and distinct intellectual results. The culture of Oxford is not the culture of Cambridge ; and both are distinct, on the one hand, from the culture of Scotland, on the other, from that represented by Trinity College, Dublin. To these types of culture we can now add that imparted in the Queen's University and its Colleges, which we venture to assert is not less specific and distinct than any of the better-known forms. It is true we cannot, in the case of Colleges fifteen years old, justify this language by an appeal to experience. But if the time and object of the establishment of the Queen's Colleges be considered—the time, when the modern languages and the physical sciences had just begun to attract that attention in education which has recently been so liberally accorded them ; the object, to educate the youths of different religious denominations on equal terms in common—the candid will, we think, acknowledge that a system of education conducted on a plan so different from any which has been tried elsewhere, and which drew its adherents from classes of society not hitherto reached by the higher education, is not unlikely to yield intellectual fruits equally characteristic and distinct. The system provides for wants not hitherto supplied, and provides for them in a way fitted to generate and preserve a type of culture suited to the circumstances of the country and to the character of the people ; and herein consists its justification on the principles we have set forth. But to return to our immediate point—in the main, we say, the existing universities in England and Ireland, though several, represent distinct forms of culture ; while over and above the universities representing culture, there is the University of London representing attainment merely, wherever or how-

ever acquired, adapted, therefore, to meet the wants of all who are unable to find a place in the more normal institutions. Now if these views be sound, it follows that the principle and entire scope of the scheme of centralization now advocated for the higher education in Ireland are essentially a mistake. The scheme starts with a false ideal ; it moves in a wrong direction ; and, if carried into practice, it must inevitably issue in pernicious results. What is wanted in our university system is not revolution and reorganization, but remedial legislation, directed to the correction of inequalities and minor abuses which have come down to us from ages of bigotry, and embracing no doubt also the adaptation of its courses and methods to the advancing conditions of human knowledge.

And from the principles just laid down we may deduce one or two more conclusions, not irrelevant to the question in hand. We may perceive in them, for example, a new reason, in addition to that already adduced, in favour of maintaining the collegiate system in university education. The connection of universities with particular colleges, far from being the factitious and obstructive incident which it has been represented—a hindrance to be got rid of by all means—is, we may now see, in truth an essential condition in order that universities should perform the main purpose for which they exist ; since it is manifestly only by maintaining this connection that degrees can be what they mainly ought to be—the representatives or emblems of culture. And again those principles furnish the reply to another question, of which, so far as we know, no intelligible solution has yet been given—the question under what circumstances and within what limits the competition between universities or other bodies granting degrees is productive of good. Every one recognizes the fact that in some instances such competition is beneficial, in others injurious ; but we are not aware that any one has furnished an explanation of these apparently conflicting phenomena. We are now, however, in a position to do so. Competition will be useful among such bodies, so long as their number is confined within the limits indicated by the principles laid down ; that is to say, so long as they represent distinct types of culture, or, as we may otherwise state it, so long as they render distinct services to the community ; and it becomes mischievous the

moment this line is passed. It will not be difficult to sustain this position by examples.

Thus a notable instance of the mischief caused by competition among bodies granting degrees is furnished by the medical schools of the United Kingdom. There are, we believe, altogether in the country some nineteen independent schools and colleges granting degrees in medicine and surgery. Of these the greater number perform identical functions, and as a consequence address themselves to the same classes of the population ; their constituency being one and the same, their competition inevitably takes the commercial turn, and they seek to recommend themselves to their "customers" by cheapening the commodity in which they deal. The result is that which is deplored by every eminent member of the profession*—a general deterioration of the standard of medical knowledge. And such inevitably would be the tendency of the proposal which has been advanced of establishing in Dublin a second university on the London University plan. Such a university could only render services already adequately rendered by the University of London. The two bodies would stand to each other in precisely the same relation as the competing medical schools, and we cannot doubt with the same result. Now take an example of competition of another kind amongst degree-granting bodies—the competition of Oxford with Cambridge, and of both with the University of London ; and an instance more pertinent to our purpose still—the competition between Trinity College, Dublin, and the Queen's University and its Colleges. With regard to the former, it will not, we imagine, be denied that the effects of the competition, so far as it is felt, are altogether salutary ; and as regards the Irish universities, we can from personal knowledge affirm that this has been eminently the case. Not only has their mutual rivalry heightened the *esprit de corps* of each, and stimulated the ardour of scientific and literary pursuit, but it has also borne fruit in substantial measures of great practical utility. And why is this ? Manifestly because in all these cases the degrees of the

* Amongst others we may cite the author of the scheme we are considering. In reference to the evils in question, he observes : "They have arisen from the competition among the nineteen licensing Universities and Colleges for the profits arising from candidates and pupils."—P. 21.

universities represent something specific and distinct, and, because in virtue of this fact, they address themselves in the main to distinct classes in the community. The competition under these circumstances has no tendency to degenerate into a process of underbidding, but rather becomes a race for distinction. The graduates of the several universities meet in the lists of life—in the professions, in politics, in literature, in society: they are known as Oxford, as Cambridge, as Dublin, and as Queen's University, men: the world takes note of the connection between the achievement and the preparation; and the university from which each has issued gains or loses *prestige*. Such has been the working of competition in this country under legitimate conditions. We borrow the following account of the operation of the same principle in Germany from Major O'Reilly's able and instructive, though one-sided and prejudiced, essay:

"The existing government of Prussia retains the entire direction of education—of the village school, the college, and the university. But with regard to their internal organization and the regulation of their studies, the Prussian Universities differ wholly from the French: instead of one University organized by fixed and uniform rules, there exist six, subject indeed to the Minister of Public Instruction, but having each their own independence, their own organization and administration, and, so to speak, their separate life. Each is a corporation, has jurisdiction over its own students; has its own senate and its own faculties; determines its own courses of study, its own examinations, and grants its own degrees. Such is the Prussian system; of which the chief characteristics are the great freedom left to the Universities under the nominal control of the government, and the freedom of emulation in teaching.* As Mr. Loomans says, 'The foundation of the Prussian organization is the *esprit de corps* which keeps up the emulation between the

* We may point out in passing the essential similarity in several fundamental points between the Prussian University system, highly applauded by Major O'Reilly, and that of the Queen's Colleges, for which he has only terms of reprobation. A more apt characterization could not be given of the organization of the latter institutions than in the words quoted above—"Great freedom, under the nominal control of the Government." Thus the governing bodies in the Colleges are Councils consisting of the Presidents and Professors representing the several Faculties; and these are vested with very considerable powers, having full authority to prescribe the courses, arrange the lectures of the Professors, settle all questions connected with the internal management of the Colleges, and in general, in the words of the Charter, "not being in any way under the jurisdiction or control of the University Senate

different Universities ; and the competition which keeps up the standard in each. To form an idea of the emulation, we should rather call it the rivalry, which exists between the German Universities, one must be in the midst of that German society so occupied with the interests of science. The Universities have acquired a consideration and an influence which are surprising. Not only are they at the head of education, but they rule all scientific and literary movement. This situation is the principal cause of their prosperity ; placed, as it were, under the eyes of the entire nation, they naturally seek to conciliate the sympathies of all."

This is healthy, invigorating, elevating rivalry, rivalry, too, identical in principle with that which is now in this country actually yielding similar fruits, similar in kind if still inferior in amount and quality ; and it is rivalry of this kind which it is now proposed to abolish in Ireland in favour of a rivalry between two central institutions "open to all comers," performing precisely the same functions and addressing themselves necessarily to precisely the same classes of the population ; in favour of a rivalry which, judging from experience, could only issue in the double evil of encouraging "cram" and degrading the standard of knowledge.

So far as to the lay scheme of Irish university reform. Turning now to the demand of the clerical party, it will be remembered that originally this was for a charter for "The Catholic University." Let us here frankly express our opinion that we see nothing in such a demand on the face of it inadmissible. On the contrary we freely concede that it is for those who resist such a claim to make out grounds for their resistance. It signifies in our view nothing that the ideas of those who founded "The Catholic University" on "the eternal principles" first evolved in the dark ages may have little in common with prevailing modes of thought in this country ; if those ideas are in fact the ideas of a section of the Irish people, we, for our parts, see no reason that every facility should not be afforded—a charter of incor-

further than as regards the regulations for qualification for the several degrees." We desire especially to call attention to the following point. "The Professors" [in the Prussian Universities], says Major O'Reilly, "are named by the King on the proposition by the Faculties of a list of three." We venture to affirm that the plan adopted in the Queen's Colleges does not in effect differ from this.

poration if that be desired—in order that such separatists from the thought and feeling of the age should, *so far as they are themselves concerned*, carry into effect their educational designs. On the assumption, therefore, that the demand for a charter for “The Catholic University” means simply a demand, on the part of persons holding certain peculiar views, to be placed on an equality, as regards State recognition, with the rest of the community, our principles would certainly lead us to the conclusion that such a claim ought to be conceded.

But, in truth, to discuss the question now before the public as if it were confined within such dimensions as these, would be to ignore all the most important elements of the case, and in fact to beat the air. The leaders of the ultramontane party have never disguised the fact that their object in this movement has been to supplant, not to supplement—to carry over the Roman Catholic population as a whole from the institutions which they now frequent to others which it is their purpose to establish, not merely to provide an exceptional institution for some exceptionally constituted persons. That this is their aim, is implied in the whole course of their procedure, from the sitting of the Synod of Thurles down to the publication of Dr. Cullen’s latest pastoral—implied in the name and pretensions of their university, in all the circumstances of its origin, above all, in the system of spiritual terrorism put in force against all who have dared to avail themselves of the mixed schools and colleges of the country. The necessity of resorting to such courses—of resorting to them, not occasionally, but incessantly and on system, of year after year raising the pitch of denunciation till it has culminated in threats of exclusion from the sacraments and other ordinances of the Church—a measure, be it remembered, equivalent in Roman Catholic estimation to exclusion from salvation—shews more conclusively even than the statistics which in a former part of this article we adduced, that the system of education against which such expedients are employed is as agreeable to the people of the country as it is obnoxious to those who have recourse to such measures of attack. No doubt those who have brought forward this cause in Parliament have taken care not to present it in this form. Parliament hears only of “the Irish people” as chafing against the grievance of liberal

institutions and hungering for a mediæval university; the bishops, if they are brought upon the scene, only appearing as intercessors in behalf of their much-enduring flocks. But even as thus stated, the argument at least implies that those who urge this demand contemplate nothing less than the overthrow of the institutions to which the "Irish people" now resort. To be sure, it is denied by these advocates that the Irish people *do* resort to them, but we have already furnished the reader with the means of judging of the value of such denials.

Such, then, and not a mere demand for freedom of educational development for a dissentient section, is the real scope and aim of the question now before the public. Started indeed and still upheld by a mere section, its purpose is to deal with the intellectual interests of the whole Irish people. A fraction of the community—the ultramontane Bishops of Ireland—seek a place for their exotic institution in the national system of the country, not for the legitimate purpose of offering its services to those who have need of and desire them, but, if not avowedly, at all events by necessary implication from their acts, in order that they may thus obtain a vantage-ground from which with more effect to coerce* into the adoption of their scheme the entire Roman Catholic community; in order

* We use the term "coerce" advisedly. The following specimen—it occurred quite recently and has been pretty generally commented on by the press—of the mode of conduct pursued will enable the reader to say whether we do so justifiably. The transaction in question was not connected with the particular subject of this essay; but the principles of conduct laid down and acted on are obviously applicable to that and all like cases.

Some time ago some Roman Catholic gentlemen in Belfast formed themselves into a Society for the cultivation of science and literature, under the title of "The Belfast Catholic Institute." From causes which we need not enter into here, the Society flourished financially, and in course of time a question arose as to the disposition of some surplus funds. The majority of the Directory had certain views upon this subject; Doctor Dorrian, the Coadjutor Bishop of the diocese, had others. The Bishop, in fact, desired to apply the disposable funds to ecclesiastical purposes, and moved a resolution to this effect, which the majority of the Directory negatived. The Bishop remonstrated, at first with the Directory, afterwards with the shareholders individually; but the Society stood firm. Whereupon the Bishop addressed to each member of the Society a circular letter, in which he made the following announcement:

"The following, as conditions of recommendation and approval, I cannot forego. They are essential to my sanction being given to this or any new company into which the Institute may be transformed, as the above condemned propositions prove:

"1—*The approval by the Bishop of such Articles of Association as he shall*

that—their fulminations and threats having fallen short of their object—they may reinforce terror by attraction, and bring such honour and emolument as the State can confer to second their ineffectual anathemas.

We confess we are wholly unable to see that this country is called upon by any principle of freedom to yield to a demand of this sort. Tyranny is not the less tyranny when its seat is in the human soul, and when it seeks its ends by threats of torture to be inflicted hereafter instead of now; and though it may be true that in this form it eludes the grasp of human legislation, though it may not be possible to bind the subtle essence of spiritual terrorism without at the same time endangering the play of legitimate moral influence—though, therefore, intolerance itself when it assumes this garb must needs be tolerated—at least there seems no reason that a liberal State should play into its hands, and make itself by deliberate action the accomplice of its designs. Many unworthy acts have been committed in the name of Liberty; but we question if the sacred word was ever more audaciously prostituted than when invoked by ultramontane Bishops against the system of education established by Sir Robert Peel.

The question, however, is no longer respecting a distinct Charter, but of affiliation on the Queen's University: it

judge satisfactory, and their adoption as the basis of any new company to be formed.

"2—*The same right, on the part of the Bishop, of approving the rules of management of Lecture-hall, Library and News-room.*

"3—*A veto by the Bishop on any member acting on the Directory, whose morals, religious principles and habits of life, the Bishop may object to.*

"4—*The approval by the Bishop, or one appointed by him, of all books and newspapers to be admitted for reading into News-room or Library; and the like approval of any lecturer to be invited to lecture for the members.*

"If these conditions be not made the basis of the Institute, I wish to give fair notice that, by whatsoever name the new association be called—and to change the name, if such be in contemplation, is not a very hopeful sign—I SHALL CONSIDER IT MY DUTY, FOR THE PROTECTION OF MY PEOPLE, TO DEBAR FROM SACRAMENTS ALL AND EVERY ONE WHO MAY BECOME A MEMBER, OR AID IN ITS CONSTRUCTION—these securities for its proper management not being first provided."

It seems to us that this is "coercion" as truly as if the menace had been of direct physical chastisement; and this, it will be observed, is not an isolated instance, but a specimen of a system of conduct. Another example occurred within the present year in the Bishop of Clonfert's pastoral denouncing the Queen's Colleges, and, were there any need, we could fill our pages with similar brutal episodes.

remains to consider how this modification affects the considerations we have just urged. Affiliation may, of course, mean very little or a great deal, according to the terms by which the relation is determined. As we have already said, the Government has not yet made public its plan ; but the *parti prêtre*, though they have on the whole kept their counsel well, have not been altogether silent. We have just had the advantage of reading a pamphlet which, though appearing anonymously, we have reason to believe proceeds from a quarter than which none is more likely to be well informed on the subject in hand.* It is in the form of a reply to the lay proposal to which we have devoted so large a portion of this paper. That proposal the writer of the pamphlet repudiates with unmeasured scorn, and, in doing so, takes occasion to lay down certain negative conditions as well as certain principles of a positive kind, which, in his view, must govern the arrangement. Amongst other significant passages, we find the following :

“Permit me to say” (the writer is addressing himself to the author of the lay scheme) “that I think you have fallen into two or three mistakes : first, in supposing that the bishops would for an instant entertain the thought of affiliating their University to the Queen’s University as at present constituted : secondly, in thinking that the Catholic University would ever be changed by them into a ‘Queen’s College,’ or into an institution at all like a Queen’s College : thirdly, in taking for granted that the Catholic University and its founders and guardians, the bishops, would surrender all ‘pretensions’ to its present title and to its University privileges derived from the Pope and admitted by all Catholics, although not recognized by the State. Nay more, I believe you are wrong in thinking that any Government, which deserves the name of ‘Liberal,’ would offer the Catholic Bishops of Ireland the insult of asking them to do any one of the three things I have mentioned. Solely with respect to the third, the bishops might waive the question of the recognition by the State of the style, title and University privileges of the Catholic University. But now to answer your question : Where is the line to be drawn in a system of affiliation ?—I

* This production, entitled “Notes on ‘University Education in Ireland,’” is announced as “printed for *private* circulation *only* ;” but as it is unquestionably intended to influence *public* opinion on a matter of the gravest *public* importance, we do not feel ourselves bound to connive at what we must regard as an unfair artifice for evading the ordinary liability to legitimate criticism, which is the proper condition attaching to such attempts in a free country.

answer : *It is to be drawn so as to secure for the Catholic University the position she is entitled to, at the head of Catholic Education in Ireland.* (The italics are the author's.) Less than this the Sovereign Pontiff will not sanction ; and it was at his suggestion the University was first established. With less than this Bishops of Ireland will not be satisfied, and it was they who founded the University, and who by their continued and determined opposition to dangerous systems of education have brought this question to its present stage ; less than this our Catholic people will not accept, and they have shewn themselves able and determined to discriminate between godless and Catholic education."

The writer does not state what constitution of the Queen's University would lead the bishops to "entertain the thought" of affiliation ; but we infer from the whole passage that they would not accept the modification suggested by the lay reformer. That suggestion, it will be remembered, is that the Senate should consist of thirty members, of which twenty (equally divided between Protestants and Catholics) should be nominated by the Crown, and the remaining ten elected by Convocation ; and this suggestion, it seems, is inadmissible. Here then, at least, we have a negative *datum*. A further clue to their requirements on this point we may find in the composition of another body in which the bishops *do* place confidence. The governing committee of "The Catholic University"—we mean the present body—is composed, as we have already stated, of twenty-four members, of which eight are bishops, eight priests, and eight laymen, the last, we believe, the nominees of the Episcopate. Keeping this in view, and remembering that this institution has been put forward as in all things a model, it will argue singular moderation if, in the constitution of the Senate of the new University, the same party is satisfied with simple preponderance, symbolized, say, by the presence on the Board of some leading members of the Episcopate. And this is the body that is to preside over and regulate the only university education to be permitted to Catholics in Ireland !

Then "The Catholic University" College is to be "at the head of Catholic education in Ireland," or, as the condition is more clearly expounded in another passage, "although there may be many halls, that is to say, colleges or schools, where Catholic youth can study, still there should be but one University College, and it should have the right to

mould all according to its own idea." On this principle, it seems, "the line is to be drawn" in the system of affiliation, and such is to be the first practical exemplification of "freedom of university education" for Catholics.

We must call attention to one passage more :

"Again, in the system you [the lay reformer] propose, why, I ask, are the colleges to be still maintained? If the University does not need its special colleges, why is this great expense to be annually incurred? The answer is obvious. Some endowed colleges would be an anomaly, unless our rulers wish to maintain the system of State education apart from religion, on whose principle these colleges were founded, and to give no countenance to the Catholic University, which was established for the maintenance of the contrary principle. But I would beg you to remember, that such an arrangement will not meet the views of the bishops, priests, and Catholic people of Ireland; and it was precisely in order to meet their views, that the present educational movement was set on foot."

We cannot say what reply the lay reformer would give to these questions; but our answer would be, that the Queen's Colleges are to be maintained because they are based on equality and justice; because they represent the ideas of the nineteenth century, not those of the thirteenth; because they have proved themselves by success suited to the requirements and tastes of the people for whom they were designed—in a word, because they are *national* colleges; and, on the other hand, that "The Catholic University" is undeserving of support, because, in spite of its pretensions, it is sectarian and not "Catholic;" because it is out of relation with the ideas and wants of the time, and has given no evidence of being acceptable to any considerable section of Roman Catholics outside the episcopal order; because, in short, such a step would be retrograde and fatal to the best interests of Ireland; and for the rest, we would remind the writer of what he and others who advance claims of this kind seem to have become wholly oblivious, that there is now a College at Maynooth in possession of the handsome endowment of £26,000 annually, established for the special and exclusive benefit of the Roman Catholic priesthood; this sum, we may observe in passing, being larger than that assigned to the Queen's University and its Colleges—institutions performing, to borrow the language of the *Times*, "truly national service."

But it is idle to criticise further. If there be any value in the remarks we have made on the proposition for a distinct Charter, they are obviously applicable with augmented force to this scheme. This is not a plan for affiliating the "Catholic University" College on the Queen's University : rather it is a plan for reconstructing the system of the Queen's University on the pattern of the "Catholic University" College. The "compromise" when examined turns out to be *the* original demand so shaped as to comprise several besides the original objects. *This* contemplated the establishment of a "Catholic University," but left the Queen's University in its present position. *That* would equally establish a "Catholic University;" but would do so on the ruins of its rival.

To conclude. We know not how far the Government may have committed itself in concession to this party ; but it seems unquestionable that to some extent it has done so. A pledge given on the eve of a general election can scarcely, after the price has been paid, be recalled with honour. But the pledge was given by the Government, not by the Liberal party or the English people ; and we have yet to see how far the country is prepared to sacrifice a great and successful policy to the exigencies of a party struggle. But should it prove that the intellectual interests of the Irish people are only thought deserving of regard, as they may be turned to account in weighting the scales of an English party, we trust at least we are not too sanguine in hoping that a greater sacrifice will not be made than the due adjustment of the political balance imperatively requires. If "something must be done," let us hope that it will be done in a manner as little mischievous as possible. If "mixed education" as a principle must be given up, let us at least save the collegiate system, and with it as far as possible accomplished results. If a mediæval University must be recognized, let us at least maintain in its integrity the single University in Ireland which represents the ideas of the nineteenth century. The concession of the original demand of the Episcopate would at least leave a rival in the field ; and it is not absolutely certain, in spite of the thunders of the Vatican and the more incessant and more effective cannonading maintained from Irish altars, that this rival might not yet hold its own.

J. E. CAIRNES.

VIL.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

1. *The Literature of the Sabbath Question.* By Robert Cox, F.S.A. Scot. In Two Volumes. Edinburgh: Maclachlan and Stewart. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1865.

MR. ROBERT COX, of Edinburgh, is a remarkable instance of a man devoting himself to that patient service which the pure love of literature prescribes. It is now many years since he compiled the Index to the seventh edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica. No one can look into that Index without admiring the extraordinary pains with which it is drawn up; and we can testify to the easy command it gives over the vast amount of information to which it relates. We believe that this task was undertaken and prosecuted from a voluntary choice of the peculiar difficulties connected with it. Our next meeting with Mr. Cox is as the author of a book entitled *Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties*. This title gives no just idea of the value of the book. Its nucleus is a Letter to the Proprietors of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway; but it spreads itself, in the form of an Appendix occupying nearly the whole volume, into a great variety of disquisitions. These are always interesting and instructive; and their very want of arrangement arises from an evident desire to do justice to the case in hand by introducing all it may require. This want is, moreover, met by another fine specimen of an Index which makes the work available for any use to which it can be put. We know no work more profitable to consult as to the literary facts bearing upon religious liberty.

Sabbath freedom in Scotland is Mr. Cox's special hobby. He has ridden it gallantly; unhorsing his antagonists in many a contest, great and small, and never being unhorsed himself. It is always a pleasure to recognize his plume, whether his visor be up or down. We have no doubt that a most amusing history of his various encounters might be constructed. In the fulfilment of his vocation he has lately published two volumes, called *The Literature of the Sabbath Question*, to which we invite the particular attention of our readers. They are very characteristic of their author. Decided and strong as are his own opinions on this question,

he has chosen to present the whole case on both sides, rather than to advocate his own view of it. In this way he has indulged his natural taste for the exhaustive treatment of any subject he takes in hand ; and has proved his confidence in his conclusions by bringing them into comparison with whatever can be opposed to them. He has fairly and fully accomplished his purpose. A more comprehensive work on the matter in hand can scarcely be imagined : and the conscientious carefulness with which it is composed is as marked as is the great amount of research it displays. We cordially recommend it as a book to be entirely depended upon, and which no one interested in religious controversy should be without. Its range of information extends far beyond the Sabbath question ; and it supplies ample means of reference as to all the points on which it touches. It commences with giving in full the passages of Scripture which have been adduced in the Sabbath controversy, and proceeds to furnish a catalogue of books relating to the Sabbath which have been published from the beginning until now. Whatever can be done, by classification, analysis, extract, comparison, and notification of all kinds, to make this course of exposition instructive and serviceable, is done ; and every portion of the mass of matter thus collected together is offered to the hand by means of Tables and Indexes marvellous for their extent of detail and exactness of arrangement. In seeking for the record of forgotten pamphlets we have not in any instance been disappointed. We have turned over the leaves for the mere pleasure of picking out the biographical and historical facts scattered through them. And our memory of old interests—such as that attaching to the Wakefield and Barbauld contest about worship—has often been unexpectedly refreshed.

The importance of this book in its bearing upon Scotch affairs cannot be too highly estimated. It is just the kind of book calculated to settle the minds of those upon whose attention new ideas on the subject of the Sabbath are being forced. This is the present condition of the religious public of Scotland ; and they are here supplied with ample means of sound judgment, at the least possible expense of offence to their prejudices. We trust they will profit by their opportunities. Norman Macleod's famous speech has drawn forth most mighty efforts of opposition,

which must re-act with a very exhaustive influence upon the body elect. Some strengthening medicine needs to be administered. Here it is, well mixed and properly labelled. We hope, for the general health's sake, that it may be freely taken. It is wonderful to some people how Scotch Sabbatarianism can retain the hold upon belief which it appears to do, the arguments by which it is defended being so sophistical, and the practices with which it is connected being so incongruous. Yet the case is plain enough. Sabbatarianism is one of those observances which pass for religious irrespective of any moral element belonging to them. It thus harmonizes with a form of Christianity which puts forth arbitrary provisions as the foundation of all its privileges. To give up the divine obligation of the Sabbath would be just to reduce Sunday rest and employment to a moral standard. Where is that to end? Why not reduce the work of Christ to a moral standard also? Why not regard a state of salvation as dependant upon moral conditions only? Why not, indeed! Men do not openly reason thus, but it is thus they instinctively feel. To remove this stone from the building is to pronounce judgment against the material of which the building is mainly composed. How dreadful it would be if each man were a law to himself, and were treated as responsible for his religious faith and obedience to God alone! Nevertheless, the motion of the earth obeys the sun. It must be comforting to Mr. Cox to think that, whereas his old book on *Sabbath Laws* was published as a protest against the closing of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railway on Sundays, his new book on *Sabbath Literature* is issued amid the hubbub occasioned by the opening of that Railway according to his wish!

F.

2. *Present Religion*. By Sarah S. Hennel. Part I. Trübner and Co. 1865.

HENNEL has given to the reading world in this book her long and careful studies on the philosophy of Adopting the reverse method to that chosen by Newman, she first shewed her faith "according to the gradual biographical construction," and then attempted "to set it forth in the contrary light

according to the intrinsic power which since its realization she has found it to possess." We have seldom taken up a work which has more deeply impressed us with the idea of conscientious severity of thought, but at the same time we cannot anticipate that in its present mode of expression the faith of our authoress will obtain any wide popularity. She herself* declares, "that to accompany her through the investigations contained in this book requires that a reader should give to it the utmost depth of studious earnestness of which that being's nature is capable," and from our own personal experience we must bear witness that "Present Religion" cannot be read without the closest and most thoughtful attention. There are no unnecessary passages, no rhetorical adornments, but, like a theorem in Euclid, each clause is necessary and must be understood if we would pass on intelligently to that which follows. A true philosophy of religion is certainly wanted at the present day, when thoughtful and devout minds are striving for certainty amid the doubts and difficulties which are suggested by the critical investigations of modern science. But the teacher of such a philosophy must adopt a clearer manner than that in which Miss Hennel writes, although some of the principles she has laid down must form its foundation. Her style is too intricate, too like the dark manner in which some German philosophers hide their meaning and perplex their readers, ever to permit her book to become popular; the long and strangely constructed sentences, bristling with parentheses, repel even thoughtful students, and we fear will cause many to lay down a work which deserves the most thorough perusal before it is half read. The deep religiousness of the whole book, and its reverence of the opinions of others, even when the authoress thinks them erroneous, are so striking, as to rouse a sentiment of affectionate esteem for a mind which is guided by a faith so profound as to perceive even in the aberrations of honest men the governing principle of a truly universal Providence, and to recognize the shortcomings of human intelligence with sympathy instead of with contempt.

To quote from such a work would be unfair; to describe

* P. 66.

its scope in a brief notice like the present would be equally unjust, even if it were possible. Suffice it to say that Miss Hennel, rejecting as she does the theology of the past, and framing for herself, we might almost say, a new religion, never either in fact or thought separates herself from an historical basis. Her new faith is to her the natural and inevitable development of all the religious forms which have gone before the one she holds as "present religion," and could never have come into existence without their having furnished the integral substance by the assimilation of which the new form has grown. Rich in thought and in faith, this work will, we regret to think, have only a limited range of readers ; but all these will close the book, gratefully acknowledging it to be a valuable and suggestive addition to theological literature. . . .

3. *Miscellaneous.*

The third volume of Mr. Sharpe's "Hebrew Scriptures"* claims a brief notice at our hands. It includes the books which in the English Bible come after the Psalms, and of course completes the work. The whole will be found a useful companion to the common version, though we may not hope or expect that, with any great number of readers, it will take its place. It will often throw light upon an obscure passage, while it very rarely departs from the simplicity or loses the vigour of the older translation. The one thing which will chiefly strike many readers in Mr. Sharpe's revision of the Prophets, is the circumstance that he has neglected the parallelism. Doubtless, by so doing, he has gained much space in this volume, and kept it down to a proper equality of size with the first and second. But this advantage is hardly a compensation for the omission of what is obviously required throughout the greater part of the prophetic books. These are, for the most part, as much poetical—that is, marked by the artificial structure of which we are speaking—as are either the Psalms or Job. In illustration of this statement we may take the first passage that presents itself on opening the

* The Hebrew Scriptures, translated by Samuel Sharpe, being a Revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament. Vol. III., Proverbs to Malachi. London : Whitfield, Green and Son.

volume, in Isaiah, and observe how readily, as here rendered, it falls into the parallel form :

“Sit thou silent, and get thee into darkness,
O daughter of the Chaldeans ;
For thou shalt no more be called, The mistress of kingdoms.
I was wroth with my people,
I polluted mine inheritance,
And gave them into thine hand.
Thou didst shew them no mercy ;
Upon the aged hast thou very heavily laid thy yoke.
And thou saidst, ‘I shall be mistress for ever ;’
Thou didst not lay these things to thy heart,
Neither didst remember the latter end of it.”

(Isaiah xlvii. 5—7.)

This is a fair example of what we refer to, shewing both the smoothness and vigour of this revision, and also the propriety of marking the peculiar structure of the original in the form of the English rendering. In this instance, the revised text keeps very close to the authorized version,—an obvious merit wherever the sense allows. The more, however, is it to be regretted that the one feature should be wanting which would have formed a conspicuous distinction and superiority, or we may even say, would have contributed to a juster representation of the passage. But, nevertheless, we have much pleasure in congratulating Mr. Sharpe on the completion of his work, and we hope it will find both the purchasers and the readers it so well deserves.

Mr. Houghton’s “*Essay on the Canticles, or the Song of Songs*”* presents a very useful epitome of the various systems of interpretation—Allegorical, Typical and Literal—of which this poem has, among both Jewish and Christian scholars, been the unfortunate victim. By giving specimens first of the recondite absurdities of allegory and type in which the Jewish Rabbis delighted as their natural element, and then of the equal absurdities of Christian Fathers, he enables the unlearned reader to judge how far the latter belong to the same school as the former, and how utterly baseless are both. The reader sees how worse than wasted is learning when so employed, since when once these non-

* *An Essay on the Canticles, or the Song of Songs ; with a Translation of the Poem, and Short Explanatory Notes.* By Rev. W. Houghton, M.A., F.L.S. London : Trübner. 1865.

natural or mystic meanings are allowed, a simple story may be made to yield a hundred different and conflicting systems of philosophy or theology as easily as one. Mr. Houghton therefore, with admirable reticence, simply exhibits the ideas of the Literal interpreters upon the meaning of the poem, which are themselves refutation sufficient of the dreams of allegorisers, and gives a general view of the best modern critical works on it. A translation of the whole poem then follows. Regarding it as essentially a drama—whether intended for scenic representation or not he does not distinctly avow—he divides it into five Parts, which might have been called Acts, and groups the speeches among various interlocutors: the Shulamite, Solomon, the Shulamite's Shepherd Spouse, and various unnamed speakers resembling the Chorus of the Greek drama, whom he describes as Court Ladies, Townsmen of Jerusalem, &c. In answer to the taunt so often hurled at the necessarily largely conjectural dissections effected by the critical school, that they agree so little among themselves as virtually to refute one another, it is satisfactory to see how considerable the agreement is, and how the differences are mainly in details. This is emphatically true of the assignment of the Pentateuch to a plurality of writers; and no less so here, of the distribution of the dialogue among various speakers. The translators chiefly followed by Mr. Houghton, directly or indirectly, appear to be Ewald and Ginsburg. To Ginsburg's translation and commentary he gives the praise which it merits as the largest and best English work on the subject. We can extract only Mr. Houghton's description of the poem.

“The simple story of this beautiful poem may be told in a few words. A village girl of Shulem, the only daughter of her widowed mother, is betrothed to a young shepherd. Their attachment appears to have excited the fears of her brothers, who were anxious for her welfare and the preservation of her chastity. They kept a strict watch over her, and sent her to look after the vineyards on their farm, where continual exposure had the effect of burning her complexion. Whether the young Shulamite was married to her shepherd lover at the time of which the poem treats, or whether she was still only betrothed, it is not easy to decide positively. I incline to the opinion that the young couple were married. One day, when on a visit to or from her

garden, where she had gone to see the opening buds of spring,—all unawares, she fell in with the cortège of King Solomon, who was, it is probable, on a spring visit to the country. Her beauty and attractions arrest the king's attention, and he captures the Shulamite damsel, places her in the royal palanquin, and takes her, an unwilling companion, to the palace at Jerusalem. She is introduced into the harem, where her sun-burnt face attracts the notice of the fair ladies of the court. True to her humble shepherd lover, the virtuous girl resists all the allurements of Solomon to win her affection. She will think only of her own true love; she asks the other ladies of the harem to leave her alone that she may enjoy the thoughts of his excellence and the assurance that she was his and he hers. The shepherd is supposed to follow her to the palace, and to gain sight of her from the outside of the palace. Solomon, finding that all his advances are in vain, allows her to leave the royal palace. Hand in hand the two faithful lovers proceed to her home, and under the quince tree, where the love-spark was first kindled, they stop and renew their vows of constancy and fidelity. The companions of the shepherd see them coming, and when they meet he asks his young wife to sing for them, which she does in words she had formerly used under the circumstances of their separation."

The careful criticism of Dr. Strauss' new "*Life of Jesus*,"* which we published shortly after its appearance,† relieves us from the necessity of doing more than drawing the attention of our readers to the "authorized translation" lately issued by Messrs. Williams and Norgate. If in form it is hardly just to one of the few German theologians who write a clear and sometimes elegant style, it may be accepted as, on the whole, a faithful representation of the substance of his work. No English student of theology who is ignorant of German should suffer this opportunity to pass by of becoming acquainted with a work which must always be representative of an important school of New-Testament criticism.

"*Poems of the Inner Life*"‡ is the title given to a new selection of religious poetry by its compiler, a well-known Unitarian minister. Both in form and contents it is a very

* *A New Life of Jesus*. By David Friedrich Strauss. Authorized Translation. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Williams and Norgate. 1865.

† T. R. Vol. I. p. 335.

‡ *Poems of the Inner Life*, selected chiefly from Modern Authors. London: Sampson Low. 1866.

"paradise of dainty devices," well chosen, well arranged and well printed. Readers may judge it differently according as they desire in it the presence or absence of certain well-known and favourite poems. Our own particular cause of gratitude to the editor, is that it contains much that either we did not know before or had only seen extracted in reviews and magazines. There are fragments of gold scattered among the sand and pebbles of our lesser poets (of late years a numerous tribe) which busy men cannot themselves search for, yet which they welcome and prize when found for them by another. Many such are brought together in these pages, some older jewels of familiar but unfading brilliancy are not wanting, while there is hardly anything that the most fastidious taste would wish away. We heartily hope that the book may meet the fate which its compiler ventures to hope for it, that it may "be found worthy of a place amongst the aids to the religious life—a welcome friend on bright days, a solace and comfort on dark ones."—In "Verses, by the Way,"* Mr. J. P. Hopps presents us with a volume of original poems, all on religious subjects. In that apparently easiest, but really most difficult of metres, blank verse, he does not appear to us to have succeeded; but some of the shorter rhymed poems have great simplicity and tenderness of expression. Mr. Hopps is plainly a man of a poetical mind, but to decide whether or no he is a poet would require more evidence than can be extracted from this tiniest of volumes.

Mr. Coupland's sermon, "Shall we not go Forward?"† would afford more substantial material for criticism if we had any clear notion of where it was that we were asked to go to. Full of extravagancies of style, not redeemed by any definiteness of thought, it is yet marked by considerable rhetorical ability, and by what, so far as its author comprehends himself, stands to him in the place of religious earnestness. We are so persuaded that Mr. Coupland will live to be ashamed of this juvenile production, that we will do nothing to save it from the forgetfulness to which, by and by, none will be so anxious as himself to consign it.—Mr.

* *Verses, by the Way.* By John Page Hopps. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1865.

† *Shall we not go Forward? a Discourse, &c.* By W. C. Coupland, B.A., B.Sc. London: Trübner. 1865.

Street's lecture on "The Night Side of Newcastle"* is an earnest and impressive account of what he saw in a round of inspection of the low lodging-houses and poor homes of that town. We are glad to hear that its delivery has already resulted in the initiation of practical measures to abate the evils which it describes.—A little anonymous brochure, entitled "Inspiration,"† is a thoughtful and well-written contribution to the liberal side of the argument. It contains nothing that has not been said before, but so long as a wilfully blind prejudice clings to its seat in the high places of religion, "repetition" must be a chief watchword of controversy. One arrow finds the mark which another misses.—"What do we as Unitarian Christians Believe?"‡ is the title of a tract by Mr. J. Page Hopps, which we understand has obtained a wide circulation. We think the name which Mr. Hopps has given to his tract unhappy and unjustifiable. "What do I, as an Unitarian Christian, Believe?" is the most that he or any other individual Unitarian has a right to declare to the world. In the present instance the error in form is complicated with an error in fact. Many Unitarian Christians (and among them ourselves) would regard it as untrue and misleading, to say, with whatever careful guarding of the phrase, that they "believe in the Atonement."

E.

* The Night Side of Newcastle, &c.: a Lecture. By J. C. Street. Newcastle. 1865.

† Inspiration. London: Trübner. 1865.

‡ What do we as Unitarian Christians Believe? By J. P. Hopps. London. 1865.

THE THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. XIII.—APRIL, 1866.

I.—ECCE HOMO.

Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ. 8vo. Pp. 330. London and Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. 1866.

It is not easy to determine the religious value of this book. The reader is at first perhaps unduly impressed by the scale of the treatment, by the breadth of the intellectual handling, the apparent intensity of the insight, and the grand clearance of the central thoughts and figures from unessential and obscuring details. Afterwards a suspicion arises whether the broader light in which Christ is made to stand out before the eye is not as much owing to what is withheld as to what is presented, whether it is not the result of a masterly but arbitrary disposal and arrangement of the materials. The truth may be that the author has wrought his own way to conceptions of Christ which, though original to him, are not new nor peculiar, and the clear glow of their freshness has for the time melted out of his mind all disturbing accessories. The first impression is one of keen delight as of gazing suddenly on the unveiled face of truth, the second is a doubt whether the qualifications in the narratives which might touch the picture with confusing shadows or cross-lights are only powerfully held back.

Of the genuine sincerity of the work, the full intellectual satisfaction and spiritual contentment of the writer with the view presented, there can be no doubt at all. He has read afresh the Gospels for himself, and reports here the great religious realities they have impressed upon his soul. He raises no critical question. For all that appears, the

Gospels, though the fourth is nominally reserved, might be taken by him to be homogeneous, absolutely consistent, and of equal historical value in all their parts. Into their structure, composition, age or differences, he does not enter. He offers his soul to their power, and receives from them an harmonious image of complex spiritual perfection which seems to him to interpret God to man—whatever does not contribute to that image silently falling away from him. He lets the Gospels winnow themselves by their natural power to build up an all-perfect but intelligible human Personality before the intent gaze of his spirit. If there is anything in the narratives foreign to this, or apparently conflicting with it, he does not treat it disrespectfully or even examine it, he simply takes no account of it. It does not coalesce with the one grand Image given off to his soul, and he lets it go.

After Strauss and Rénan, it is a Christian rehabilitation to feel the Gospels producing in this way their natural effects upon the mind and heart. Instead of dissolving the materials into nothing by minute intellectual criticism and assumed scientific canons, or accepting an incongruous Christ who mingles the Spirit of God with earthly artifice, who can take advantage of a deception and change his purpose with the outward chances of success, we have a sifting process performed by the spiritual faculty alone, and the broad historic outlines are permitted to convey a divine image undisturbed, provided only they comply with the two conditions, that they perfectly cohere with one another, and that no explanation but that of their truth adjusts itself to the facts. It may be said that this is to introduce an arbitrary principle of selection, that you must either take all or reject all, or shew by undeniable intellectual and historical marks and grounds of judgment how you discriminate between what you take and what you leave. It is at least not arbitrary, inasmuch as it conforms to a law of the spirit, and is determined in each individual by spiritual necessities. Whatever, indeed, historical criteria can clearly establish as fact, or as clearly set aside, is not subject to revision, as history, by any spiritual organ or faculty. In the latter case, whatever other legitimate use may be made of it, it must henceforth as reality be withdrawn from spiritual consideration. No gain to the spirit

which a belief in it might be supposed to bring can justify its contemplation as fact if historical reasoning, by its own methods, has legitimately deprived it of that character. This would be arbitrary, and an arbitrary preference of the accidental directions and shapings of our own imperfect spirits to such enlargement and purification as God might confer upon our souls if we withdrew them from all that we knew to be self-willed, and held them steadfast reverently and trustingly within the realm of His realities. But, on the other hand, in all those representations to which historical criteria can attach no marks of absolute disproof, but yet cannot establish as facts, we are at liberty, so far as rejection is concerned, to follow a purely spiritual law of selection, and to omit them altogether from consideration if the soul refuses, as naturally impossible, to hold them in co-existence with its other instinctive judgments and divine contents. We are not permitted, on such grounds, to declare their falsehood or unreality, for the spiritual affinities that now reject them may themselves be imperfect and untrue; but we are permitted to hold that for the present they have, and can have, no spiritual significance for us, and that not so much by an act of will as by an act of necessity do they fall away from images and convictions in the soul with which they cannot coalesce. We do not mean that the author propounds or consciously recognizes this principle of selection, but that he acts upon it in presenting the materials which compose his conception of Christianity. It is, in fact, what every one must do, consciously or unconsciously, to whom Christianity is a spiritual revelation consistent with itself. There is a sense in which Christ still says to every Christian, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." It is not what we take from the Gospels, but rather that in the Gospels which takes divine hold on us, that builds up Christ within us. There are, doubtless, many things in him that as yet have found no adequate mirror, no faculty of due receptiveness, in any human soul. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." We all receive according to what we have, according to what we are. Under this limitation to which every soul is subject in apprehending a perfection which has held the same relation of inexhaustible significance to so many ages of spiritual

thinkers, and is for ever disclosing something new to competent recipients, "Ecce Homo" exhibits a spiritual discernment of the very highest order, with the rarest combination of breadth, strength, and delicacy—tested, as such power can alone be tested, by apparent discords melting into the truest harmonies, by the number of conflicting elements shewn to be kindred points, by the perfect unity perceived and established in wide-ranging contrasts of feeling and of action. In reading this book we seem for the time to get rid of the whole class of middle-men, of reporters and commentators, of schoolmen and theologians, of preachers and critics, and to feel the Master's eye upon us. The highest praise it could win is that to so great an extent it justifies its title, "Ecce Homo."

The author, indeed, in a letter to the *Spectator*, has modestly declared that his work is not the presentation of Christ, but the process of investigation that has put him in possession of a distinct conception of Christ. And this is also true. He avows that after much reflection and reading of theological and critical lives of Christ, no character in history remained so incomprehensible to him. He therefore undertook, so far as was possible to him, an unbiassed examination of the original documents with the view of ascertaining, not whether there was or was not at all points a minute agreement, but whether they combined to convey to him a grand and original spiritual Personality fitted by his own properties to be the Redeemer of Mankind, to withdraw them from essential Evil and attach them to essential Good, consistent with himself in his character, in his objects and in his means, and so by right of possession, by an actual discharge of the functions, taking his great place in the counsels of God as universal Deliverer, Master, and King. He professes to have entered on no theological question as to the person of Christ, but simply to have investigated what was the end that Christ proposed to himself; to what extent he succeeded, and must continue to succeed, in that end; and how far the salvation of the world is inseparable from that end, and from One through whom it could have a realization. In all these respects he finds Christianity to be a divine fact, that is, to be worthy of God, and actually in operation. He says that he has raised no theological question in connection with the nature

of Christ. But it is impossible to exhibit the salvation of mankind, and the relations of men to him in whom the salvation is, without raising a theological question about his person. He has raised the question, and settled it. He may hold theological opinions that are not indicated in this book; but he now can never shew that those opinions are essential to a Christianity, to a kingdom of God, which he has already exhibited and spiritually vindicated in its aims, its authority and its instruments, independently of anything that may be contained in those unknown opinions. He has shewn the possibility of God having a kingdom in this world on the foundation of the human personality of Christ. He has declared that there is no infidelity so false and barren as that which denies the divine Sonship and limits the spiritual possibilities of man. After that it will not wound us, nor disturb our regard for the unknown author, if we find that he believes in an Eternal Son, yielding to the metaphysical theology essentially low in its theory, however lofty its disciples, which teaches that God can touch and feed no type of spiritual being but His own, which therefore cannot confide in an eternal Father, if there is only an eternal *father*, to inspire and evoke the *filial* type of character, and rear it to perfect responses of affection and life by paternal quickenings and communications from Himself. But it would grieve and disappoint us to the heart if he was to exhibit a theological consistency and a spiritual inconsistency which would go to deprive us of a Christianity he has already established for us on the grounds simply of the relations of man to God, as of a child to a heavenly Father. He has told us "what Christianity is," and we accept what he has told us. He says he has yet to investigate, "Who Christ is;" but no answer he may give to that question can now legitimately affect the other question previously determined. The *Spectator* perceived this, and felt with a sigh that in its theory of Christianity it had parted company with a great spiritual power.

Of the three parts into which he thinks the whole investigation is resolvable—Christ's Call to Men, his Legislation for the Kingdom into which he called them, and his own divine Royalty or personal relation to Jehovah—the author, as we have said, professes to reserve the last as the subject of another volume. But, in fact, among the earlier chapters

of the present volume is one bearing the title, "The Royalty of Christ." And with some confusion, at least of nomenclature, under the functions he accepts in his divine royalty again appear the three offices of Caller, Legislator, and in a certain high and peculiar sense, of the spiritual Judge of a new and divine Society. All these offices had been imaged under Judaism, but Christ is invested with them anew, not as the representative of Abraham, Moses, or David, but, by a fresh and higher issue from the same Authority that commissioned them, as the representative of God himself. They were shadows of good things to come: he could not derive from them, for he was the full Word of God to man, the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person. His Call was the Invitation of the universal Father to all His children; his Legislation was the Law of the Holy Spirit; his Judgment was the awful severity tempered by the not less awful mercy of Him who knows the heart. In his kingly character he rejects all the offices that earthly royalty can discharge or represent—the receipt of custom, the regulation of finance, the administration of justice, the leadership of armies: he retains all the offices that represent the rule of God himself on earth or in heaven. Unlike Abraham, he is the Founder of an everlasting Society: unlike Moses, he is the Legislator, not of a nation or an age, but of the realm of spirits: unlike Judge or King, he sits on no visible throne and inflicts no visible penalty, but sets up the tribunal of God in the secret conscience and issues the awards from which there is no appeal. He is a spiritual King, representing on earth the rule of the invisible majesty of Heaven because he is the very image of the Father, Son of God and Son of Man: therefore is he able to draw his brethren to the Father he reveals: therefore is he able, through communion of the Holy Spirit, to make them a Law unto themselves: therefore is he able by fellowship, participation of life, with the Father and with the Son to make them members in an eternal Society, to deliver them from the world and its judgments, and to destroy the power of earth and hell. All these are truly Kingly offices, worthy representations of God's own rule, but surely not beyond the power or the province of any spiritual being of whom the Father could say, to beings of like nature, "This is my Son."

Our author finds Jesus making unbounded personal pretensions as Master and Lord of men. How does he sustain those pretensions? How does he obtain acceptance and followers for him and them? What are his credentials? Nothing could have availed him long, nothing could have given him even for a moment the kind of authority he desired to possess, but the essential credential that he really was what he claimed to be. The powers of attraction required to draw men into sympathy with his spirit and to unite them in the desire for a divine Society, a family of God to whom he was the type of a Brother and a Son, must have belonged to him and been exerted by him wherever there was an opportunity of making himself known: but even the possession of these powers would not account in the first place for the fact that he commanded the adhesion of Jews not merely in admiration of his goodness or wisdom, but as the head of a State, as the founder of a Church foreign to all their biasses, destructive of their most cherished expectations, not a birth from but a mortification of "the consciousness of the Age." Between his purpose and its success, the spiritual recognition of himself for what he was, the history interposes the instrumentality of supernatural power. But, as our author finely argues, supernatural power by itself was not fitted to procure for him the kind of ascendancy he desired, but exactly that kind of ascendancy which he was determined not to have. The power that directed men's eyes towards him, misdirected their souls. As Messiah of the Jews, supernatural power might have enthroned him at once: as a spiritual ruler in the Conscience, and the Head of the whole family of man, it could have authenticated no claim for him. The Jews wrought his death by the charge that he claimed to be a King in a sense offensive to the Romans. The real ground of their hatred unto death was that he would not consent to be a King in any sense that would give to the Romans a moment's care, and that he did claim to be a King in a sense that must have irritated and maddened every Jew who did not understand him. The supernatural power that was necessary to give him a chance of success was yet opposed to all his real objects. It had no tendency to draw men into spiritual sympathy with him: it had a powerful tendency to create outward partizanship, and to inflame

unholy anticipations. And thus supernatural power, though a necessary instrument in Christ's hands, vastly complicated the conditions within which a purely moral power prevailed, indefinitely multiplied the difficulties within which his spiritual perfection was manifested and his spiritual victories were won. To make it felt that God was with him, and yet that he would not interfere to force assent or even to punish malignant enmity, so that if accepted he should be accepted only for love of himself, if rejected he should be rejected without fear of consequences, was surely the crowning miracle of perfectness.

"He deliberately determines to found his empire upon the consent, and not the fears of mankind, to trust himself with his royal claims and his terrible purity and superiority defenceless among mankind, and however bitterly their envy may persecute him, to use his supernatural powers only in doing them good. This he actually did, and evidently in pursuance of a fixed plan; he persevered in this course, although politically, so to speak, it was fatal to his position, and though it bewildered his most attached followers; but by doing so he raised himself to a throne on which he has been seated for nigh two thousand years, and gained an authority over men greater far than they have allowed to any legislator, greater than prophecy had ever attributed to the Messiah himself."*

Though the Call of Christ into the kingdom of God was infinitely comprehensive, given to all, as needed by all, yet a spiritual test was applied by the nature of the Call itself. The winnowing fan that separated the wheat from the chaff was in the willingness of those to whom it came to hearken and obey. No heresy in Pharisee, Sadducee, Samaritan or Gentile, no moral loathsomeness in publican or sinner, created a disqualification for membership in the new Theocracy. If any man was excluded he was self-excluded, he was satisfied with himself, the light had no attraction for him, he loved the darkness better, he was shut up in convention, he felt no inclination to leave his old ground and follow the beckonings of One who was shewing him the divine glory in his nature. If any man was attracted by the Call, that was proof that he was worthy to receive it. Whatever his past condition, God was now speaking to his spirit, and would lead him on for ever. To this Call sanc-

timoniousness might be dead, and dissoluteness alive. The spiritual passions might repel it, and the carnal passions be pierced by it through and through. Any one who had only a sensibility to goodness could open the door of his heart, and keep it open for Christ, and God, and all the children of the Kingdom to come in and fill it. Now what is the name of this pure metal in human nature, which yields to the attraction of a heavenly power? As long as there is a grain of it left in a soul it will shew itself if the magnet is powerful enough, and the whole soul be drawn out of its slough. The Christian name of this sensibility is Faith, not in itself goodness, or holiness, or self-denial, but the power of being touched by goodness, holiness, and self-denial, so as, gradually or suddenly, to leave all and follow them. The professed Saint may be without this sensibility and refuse the invitation of the King and Lord of his nature to come in and join his company, and hug himself in the outer circle of isolation and convention: the confessed Sinner may have it and need no other wedding garment to sit down at the Marriage Feast with the Son of the King among the Bridegroom's friends. In its rudiments it is simply the felt potentiality of Goodness; in its developed state it is the power that dwells serenely in the heart of a child of God to recognize what is of God and to meet every test of loyalty the Father can apply. It is a movement, however faint at first, towards God and whatever speaks of God. And hence the characteristic doctrine and the all-merciful Call of Christ, that we are saved not by goodness but by the power of becoming good, that we are saved by Faith, and that there are no sacrifices or works of the Spirit, no aspects or lineaments of God in a filial nature, to which an exercised Faith does not grow equal.

"We want a test which shall admit all who have it in them to be good whether their good qualities be trained or no. Such a test is found in Faith. He who, when goodness is impressively put before him, exhibits an instinctive loyalty to it, starts forward to take its side, trusts himself to it, such a man has faith, and the root of the matter is in such a man. He may have habits of vice, but the loyal and faithful instinct in him will place him above many that practise virtue. He may be rude in thought and character, but he will unconsciously gravitate towards what is right."*

* P. 66.

"To what conclusion then are we led by these reflections on the question, What was involved in accepting Christ's Call? Those who gathered round him did in the first place contract an obligation of personal loyalty to him. On the ground of this loyalty he proceeded to form them into a Society, and to promulgate an elaborate legislation, comprising and intimately connected with certain declarations, authoritatively delivered, concerning the nature of God, the relation of man to Him, and the invisible world. In doing so he assumed the part of a Moses. Now the legislation of Moses had been absolutely binding upon the whole community. Disobedience to his laws had been punished by the civil judge, and so had every act which implied a conception of the Divine Nature different from that which he had prescribed." * * *

"In this respect the new Moses is infinitely more tolerant. There are no specific acts which are unpardonable to the Christian. No amount of disobedience which can be named, no amount of disbelief or ignorance of doctrine, is sufficient to deprive a man of the name of Christian. For it is held in the Christian Church that the man most stained with crime, and even most unsuccessful in breaking himself of criminal habits, and in the same manner the man whose speculative notions are most erroneous or despairing, may yet possess that rudiment of goodness which Christ called faith. But, on another side, the new Moses is infinitely more exacting than the old. For the most blameless observance of the whole law is not enough to save the Christian from exclusion, unless it has actually sprung from genuine goodness. It may spring from natural caution or long-sighted selfishness, and in the heart of the strict moralist there may be no spark of faith. For such a moralist Christ has no mercy. And so it became a maxim in the Christian Church that faith justifies a man without the deeds of the law."*

Of the genuineness, or at least the absolute sincerity for the time, of the Faith that accepted the Call, our author thinks that Christ employed a test in the necessity of a public Baptism, and afterwards extended the test over the whole period of earthly life in the fuller symbolism of the Lord's Supper,—and that these were, and still continue to be, indispensable signs and pledges of an actual incorporation into the new Society. This is not of a piece with the rest of his thoughts on Christ and Christianity. It is to pour the new wine into the old skins. Rather, with one who in all other respects has given so spiritual a view of the Kingdom of God on earth, independently of all external

* Pp. 80—82.

rites or usages, it is not so much to put new cloth on an old garment, as to introduce a patch from the old garment into the new cloth. He is strangely misled by the case of Nicodemus who came to Christ by night, whom our Lord would not accept because he wanted faith to come openly by day. If he had had that which Baptism symbolized, Christ would not have spoken to him about the Sign. With Nicodemus he insisted on the rite, only because he wanted the reality. And had Nicodemus been in a less conspicuous position, perhaps Christ might not have exposed the unworthiness of shirking, and have admitted his half-conversion and let it grow to more. But how could a Nicodemus be suffered to steal forth to meet Christ by night, and sit with closed heart in the Great Council of his enemies by day? It is a remarkable oversight to infer a perpetual and universal ceremony from a crucial instance on the other side. The mistake of making a public Baptism, in addition to the Faith that Baptism symbolized, indispensable to the reception of the Call, "as indispensable to membership as that spiritual inspiration which is membership," is repeated in making the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper a part of the positive and perpetual legislation of Christ for his universal Church. We think that Christ, by an act of perfect spiritual genius, made the material and the occasion which the hour supplied significant for ever of eternal meanings which he was to have no opportunity on earth in words to speak to them again,—and that as the wonderful power of this symbolism still remains, it is wise and right in us thus to incorporate ourselves from age to age into the body of Christ, and by symbolic acts to place our discipleship in fellowship with each other and union with God, in one spirit, one life, one community, one nourishment, with a fulness that no other language can convey. Nothing that the author can say of the natural power of this symbolism is beyond our feeling. Though he has needlessly changed the word, we are one with him at heart, that "the Christian Communion is a club-dinner: but the club is the New Jerusalem; God and Christ are members of it; death makes no vacancy in its lists, but at its banquet-table the perfected spirits of just men, with an innumerable company of angels, sit down beside those who have not yet surrendered their bodies to the grave." We accept his interpretation of the symbols,

that "the union of mankind, but a union begun and subsisting only in Christ, is what the Lord's Supper sacramentally expresses," and that "it is an habitual feeding on the Character of Christ, so that the essential nature of the Master seems to pass into and become the essential nature of the servant—loyalty carried to the point of self-annihilation—that is expressed by the words, 'eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ.'" Yet notwithstanding all this it is most worthy of Christ to believe that he spoke only from the inspiration of a great emergency, to meet the pressing wants of the feeble and dim-sighted men around him as they could be met in no other way, and that nothing of the nature of a formal legislation for his Church through all succeeding time was in the moved heart of him whose words became things, and have not passed away. Baptism and the Supper, like the observance of Sunday, rest on other grounds than those of positive precept.

Christ's way of saving the world was to draw men into a Church of the living God, a Church in which God was to be a living God to every individual in it, uniting the members as brethren through the divine personal relations of each to the Father of all. To make this possible it was necessary that the true relations of God to the human spirit should be shewn in some one man, that human nature in its religious aspects should become an object of intense and awful interest to men, that by contemplating all men in the mirror of that one man the divine possibilities in every individual should become clear, and a passionate force of love and hope be directed towards him. Before this could take place one man must represent God's idea of human nature, and that man be regarded by faith as the real man, the divinely implanted man, within the personality of every other man, as the statue within the marble, rather as the plant within the seed, the oak within the acorn, waiting for its natural development. Before men can feel the full attraction of God they must have had some opportunity of discerning what human nature becomes when the Spirit dwells within it as a dove, meeting with no resistance; they must have seen the glory of God on some one human face. Before men can feel a passionate love for all other men, a love that no individual foulness or loathsomeness can repel, they must have seen with their bodily or their

spiritual eyes some one man in whom this intense fellowship with humanity, as the child of one Father, was as the indwelling peace and power of God in the beauty of holiness. This was, and is, the function of the Christ. Men know the perfect Father when they see a perfect son. Men know human nature when they see a veritable man. And this could be accomplished only by a living man filling these divine relations to God and Man. Without the existence of the personal reality, the Idea could have had no possession of mankind. Words could not communicate it, and, if they could, no one had the Idea before Jesus fulfilled it in life. No man had conceived how absolute Holiness and absolute Mercy were reconcilable in God, before they were seen reconciled in Christ. Only in His perfect image could man ever have discerned the spiritual unity of God; not unity of person, but the unity of character, of affection, of judgment, and of act.

The distinguishing power and method of Christ become known by comparing them with the power and method of any other instrument for the education of mankind, whether of Law as of a Moses, or of Philosophy as of a Socrates. Law is negative and authoritative, and the authority it wields does not reside in the spirit that obeys, for if it did the spirit itself would become law-making and take its righteousness direct from personal fellowship with the Holy Spirit. And Law, even if it could be perfect and universal, supplying a direction for every possible case, has no power of getting itself loved or even obeyed. A perfect Law might have no tendency to make perfect men, and certainly would have no tendency by force of inward persuasion to make bad men good. Philosophy does aim at touching the springs of individual conviction and assent, but it is the assent of the reason. Philosophy is an intellectual influence upon thought. Christ is a personal influence upon feeling. Philosophy aims at self-dependence and self-government. Christ imparts the self-surrender of aspiration and love. Philosophy loses true life by seeking it. Christ finds it in divine impulses and affections. Philosophy would make the individual sufficient to himself. Christ regards an isolated, self-regarding man as outside the church and family of God. Philosophy investigates what is right on abstract considerations. Christ makes the heart discern it, love it,

and eager to do it. Philosophy is an argumentative, Christ is a living power. By what process of reasoning, our author asks, "can the bad man be turned into the good? Where is the demonstration that will make the selfish man prefer another's interest to his own? Where is the logical dilemma that can make a knave honest?" Now this is the very power that Christ supplies—the power to make the bad good. Philosophy could not do it, even if it succeeded in all that it undertook. But Christ aims at the heart, declares his right to take possession of the whole spiritual nature by shewing to it what is divine, by commanding its reverential love. He may not succeed at once, or altogether, for many things prevent men from seeing him as he is, but so far as he succeeds he is in possession of the citadel, and cannot be ejected. The awakening of admiration and affection, of gratitude and reverence, towards some person of conspicuous goodness is the first movement in a bad man's heart towards true life, the first revelation of God. Let Christ, as he was and lived, be "on the pedestal of a man's heart," and that man is saved, he is in new relations with earth and heaven, and his whole life in God will open upon him. The regenerating power of Christ is in the touch of his personal goodness on the springs of reverential love. No man, however bad, in whom the very possibilities of faith are not extinguished, is beyond the reach of this power. Our author cites one instance of the effect of the personal influence of Jesus, of the magical passing of goodness out of the heart of a good man into the hearts of bad men with whom he is in contact. It is the effect of his treatment on all concerned in the case of the woman detected in adultery. He makes no remarks upon the genuineness of the passage; but thinks it apparently an interpolation in the place where it occurs.

"The shame of the deed itself, and the brazen hardness of the prosecutors, the legality that had no justice and did not even pretend to have mercy, the religious malice that could make its advantage out of the fall and ruin and ignominious death of a fellow-creature—all this was eagerly and rudely thrust before his mind at once. The effect upon him was such as might have been produced upon many since, but perhaps upon scarcely any man that ever lived before. He was seized with an intolerable sense of shame. He could not meet the eye of the crowd, or of the

accusers, and perhaps at that moment least of all of the woman. Standing as he did in the midst of an eager multitude that did not in the least appreciate his feelings, he could not escape. In his burning embarrassment and confusion he stooped down so as to hide his face, and began writing with his finger on the ground. His tormentors continued their clamour, until he raised his head for a moment and said, 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her,' and then instantly returned to his former attitude. They had a glimpse perhaps of the glowing blush upon his face, and awoke suddenly with astonishment to a new sense of their condition and their conduct. The older men naturally felt it first and slunk away; the younger followed their example. The crowd dissolved and left Christ alone with the woman. Not till then could he bear to stand upright; and when he had lifted himself up, consistently with his principle, he dismissed the woman, as having no commission to interfere with the office of the civil judge. But the mighty power of living purity had done its work. He had refused to judge a woman, but he had judged a whole crowd. He had awakened the slumbering conscience in many hardened hearts, given them a new delicacy, a new ideal, a new view and reading of the Mosaic Law. And yet this crowd was either indifferent or bitterly hostile to him. Let us imagine the correcting, elevating influence of his presence upon those who, so far from being indifferent, were bound to him by the ties which bind a soldier to his superior officer, a clansman to his chief, a subject to a king ruling by Divine right, aye, and by ties far closer. The ancient philosophers were accustomed to inquire about virtue, whether it can be taught. Yes! it can be taught, and in this way. But if this way be abandoned, and moral philosophy be set up to do that which in the nature of things philosophy can never do, the effect will appear in a certain slow deterioration of manners which it would be hard to describe had it not been described already in well-known words: 'Sophistry and calculation' will take the place of 'chivalry.' There will be no more 'generous loyalty,' no more 'proud submission,' no more 'dignified obedience.' A stain will no more be felt like a wound, and our hardened and coarsened manners will lose the 'sensibility of principle and the chastity of honour.'**

This is a very fine passage, admirable for the purpose of shewing the difference between preceptive or scientific and living or instinctive goodness, yet we doubt whether the explanation is worthy, whether the sense of shame confused the face of Christ, whether this is the true interpretation

* Pp. 104, 105.

of his stooping to the ground. Had judgment alone been his object he would not have withdrawn his eyes either from the woman or from the hypocrites whose sin was worse than hers. It was not judgment but effectual judgment that he aimed at—judgment that would pass into their conscience, and not be resisted by their pride. And so he gave them the advantage of not being provoked and tempted to brazen it out before him, and they could escape out of his presence, self-condemned, through his face being turned away, as they could not have done, without too deadly a wound to their self-righteousness, if his eye had been full upon them in its awful challenge and anger.

The larger portion of the volume is occupied with an examination of the so-called Legislation of Christ for the Church, divine Society or Kingdom, into which he called men. Yet the author clearly perceives that any minute or positive legislation is inconsistent with the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, that the very essence of the new service consists in its being a dictate of the heart, an inspiration and a spiritual discernment, a suggesting and directing affection, and that therefore "to discuss the legislation of Christ is to discuss his character, for it may be justly said that Christ himself is the Christian Law." That is, Christ does not by legislation lay down complete directions of conduct, but in his own person displays the full fruits of the Spirit of God in man. The complete outgoings of life and obedience, the issues of all holy and of all merciful impulses acting in harmony, are written in him. The real Lawgiver to whom he commits us, with whom he acquaints us, is the Spirit of the Father in us; but in addition to awakening the filial consciousness within the soul he aids us to hear and to interpret all the voice of the Spirit by being himself a Son who did whatsoever he saw that the Father did, and who left undone nothing that the Father prompted. The method the author has adopted has in some respect injured the full spiritual value of his work. By professing to determine *what* Christianity is without determining *who* Christ is, he is compelled as far as possible to omit Christ's personal relation to God, and to make Christ, not God, the central attraction in the divine community, as though the power by which he wrought such wonderful effects on the spiritual consciousness of men was in himself,

and not in the recognition which he gave them of the Spirit of his Father working in him and in them. Not that this is really his meaning; he sees clearly that the vital force of the whole system is the living feeling that God is the Father of every spirit; but undertaking to investigate simply what Christ did, and what was his object in founding the Society called by his name, and how it (the Society) is adapted to attain that object, he is not able to give uniform prominence to the ultimate truth, that where the image of God in Christ is a soul's first attraction to goodness the attraction is yet not full or final until it is with God himself—that Christ really is what he is so often said to be with no understanding of the office, a Mediator, who awakens the consciousness of the Spirit in us, who shews us the Father, and so at last conducts the soul to communion with the Holy Spirit with no one, not even himself, between. The perfect action of Christ's spirit is in the fulfilment of his prayer: "As Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be one, even as we are." How is this possible unless we may be related to God, not in measure, but in kind, as Christ was? And how is it possible to determine Christ's object in founding the divine Society, without giving prominence to this filial relation in him and in us? The relations of men to one another arising out of their common relations to God are indeed distinctly stated by Christ, and the statement of them in words may be called a Legislation, but maxims can neither embody nor enforce them, and in altogether new circumstances only the Spirit that originates them can give them either delineation or effect. Christ's Kingdom is with extraordinary power set forth in this book as a true Brotherhood founded in devotion and self-sacrifice—a Brotherhood into which selfishness or mercenary consideration of rewards of happiness cannot enter, inasmuch as it is a contradiction and an impossibility to love your enemy, or to love any one, out of a regard for your interests. What is the living force that draws men into this Brotherhood? The force of Love, of love for every man as Man, as potential Man, however impossible it may be in his existing condition to have moral respect or sympathy for the actual man. It is most true that it is the ideal Man within the actual man, a love for the Christ who is in every man—when a human being is wretched, to feel that

one with whom Christ has identified himself asks you for relief—when a human being is degraded, to feel that one with whom Christ has identified himself, and in whom he may be made to appear with the stains cleared away and the glory developed, requires you to deliver him—that this alone can work the miracles of self-sacrifice, that it is the life of the Church, without which the Kingdom of God can never come to earth. How is this all-powerful love to be kindled and fed? Our author calls it “the Enthusiasm of Humanity.” It is the spring of Christian action. It is the passion “that can lift a man clean out of all sin whatever,” for love desires good only. And as it is a passionate interest in individuals, it is possible only to one who sees every man, not as he is, but potentially in Christ. All this is true; and yet the Enthusiasm of Humanity will never bring the Kingdom of God to earth, and the life of Christ will never make universal the Enthusiasm of Humanity, until it is felt that Christ lives in every man because every man lives in God, that our communion is with the Father and the Son, that we are branches in the vine whose roots are in the Holy Spirit, that as children of God we are joint-heirs with Christ, that the fountain of life to him is the fountain of life to us. We do not mean that all this is not implied in “*Ecce Homo*,” but it is obscured, held in subordination by the method of the investigation which forbids it to be said how far the relation of the Son to the Father is analogous to ours. The consequence is that contrary to the author’s whole spirit, to the intent of his heart, the Enthusiasm of Humanity and the Example of Christ appear more in an ethical and less in a religious aspect than he means. We know there are passages in which it is expressly stated that Christ treats men as standing in the relation of brothers to one another under a common Father in heaven, but we doubt whether there is any passage in which it is declared that the same Power which wrought in Christ himself must come to work in us, and that the Building is God’s with Christ for the corner-stone. The spell of Christ’s character is indeed mighty, but its divinest power is in unveiling what is hidden to carnal eyes, in revealing the Spirit of the Father dwelling and acting in each heart. It may be significant of an occult theology that in one place the title Son of Man is strangely explained,

not in his being the perfect out-come, the flower and culmination of Humanity, but from the universality of his dominion over man, as a king takes a title from the nations over which he rules. Yet surely the following noble passage, in which all men appear as brothers of Christ, is a basis for a Christian Theology, and cannot consist with a Theology that would require more than is therein implied from any one who takes its every word to heart, as we do. He is explaining how Christ is sufficient to raise the Enthusiasm of Humanity.

"It is not absolutely necessary to humanity that a man shall have seen *many* men whom he can respect. The most lost cynic will get a new heart by learning thoroughly to believe in the virtue of *one* man. Our estimate of human nature is in proportion to the best specimen of it we have witnessed. This then it is which is wanted to raise the feeling of humanity into an enthusiasm; when the precept of love has been given, an image must be set before the eyes of those who are called upon to obey it, an ideal or type of man which may be noble and amiable enough to raise the whole race and make the meanest member of it sacred with reflected glory. Did not Christ do this? Did the command to love go forth to those who had never seen a human being they could revere? Could his followers turn upon him and say, How can we love a creature so degraded, full of vile wants and contemptible passions, whose little life is most harmlessly-spent when it is an empty round of eating and sleeping; a creature destined for the grave and for oblivion when his allotted term of fretfulness and folly has expired? Of this race Christ himself was a member, and to this day is it not the best answer to all blasphemers of the species, the best consolation when our sense of its degradation is keenest, that a human brain was behind his forehead and a human heart beating in his breast, and that within the whole creation of God nothing more elevated or more attractive has yet been found than he? And if it be answered that there was in his nature something exceptional and peculiar, that humanity must not be measured by the stature of Christ, let us remember that it was precisely thus that he wished it to be measured, delighting to call himself the Son of Man, delighting to call the meanest of mankind his brothers. If some human beings are abject and contemptible, if it be incredible to us that they can have any high dignity or destiny, do we regard them from so great a height as Christ? Are we likely to be more pained by their faults and deficiencies than he was? Is our standard higher than his? And yet he associated by preference with these

meanest of the race ; no contempt for them did he ever express, no suspicion that they might be less dear than the best and wisest to the common Father, no doubt that they were naturally capable of rising to a moral elevation like his own. There is nothing of which a man may be prouder than this ; it is the most hopeful and redeeming fact in history ; it is precisely what was wanted to raise the love of man as man to enthusiasm. An eternal glory has been shed upon the human race by the love Christ bore it. And it was because the Edict of Universal Love went forth to men whose hearts were in no cynical mood but possessed with a spirit of devotion to a man, that words which at any other time, however grandly they might sound, would have been but words, penetrated so deeply, and along with the law of love the power of love was given. Therefore also the first Christians were enabled to dispense with philosophical phrases, and instead of saying that they loved the ideal of man in man could simply say and feel that they loved Christ in every man." * * * "Christ believed it possible to bind men to their kind, but on one condition—that they were first bound fast to himself. He stood forth as the representative of men, he identified himself with the cause and with the interests of all human beings, he was destined, as he began before long obscurely to intimate, to lay down his life for them. Few of us sympathize originally and directly with this devotion ; few of us can perceive in human nature itself any merit sufficient to evoke it. But it is not so hard to love and venerate him who felt it. So vast a passion of love, a devotion, so comprehensive, elevated, deliberate and profound, has not elsewhere been in any degree approached save by some of his imitators. And as love provokes love, many have found it possible to conceive for Christ an attachment the closeness of which no words can describe, a veneration so possessing and absorbing the man within them, that they have said, 'I live no more, but Christ lives in me.' Now such a feeling carries with it of necessity the feeling of love for all human beings. It matters no longer what quality men may exhibit ; amiable or unamiable, as the brothers of Christ, as belonging to his sacred and consecrated kind, as the objects of his love in life and death, they must be dear to all to whom he is dear. And those who would for a moment know his heart and understand his life must begin by thinking of the whole race of man, and of each member of the race, with awful reverence and hope."*

The law-giving power under Christianity is a spirit of love suggesting and impelling the actions of goodness. Those

who did nothing out of love for God and man, though they broke no law, Christ condemned. This is what our author means when he speaks of enthusiasm as indispensable to any fellowship with Christ. This Morality he calls positive, the duty of doing good as distinguished from the duty of not doing harm—departing from the usual nomenclature which calls “positive” the morality of express enactment as distinct from that of free suggestion. His use of the word is so far legitimate that the three great divisions of human goodness were certainly declared, or enacted, to be essential by Christ, necessary fruits of the Spirit, though not necessarily the same in action and in form with each individual,—Mercy, Edification, and Forgiveness—the duty of removing the sufferings and of increasing the happiness of men—the duty of building up their souls and drawing them to their place in the Family and Church of God—the duty of having pure and active our love for them, our desire and endeavour to do them good, notwithstanding any malicious injuries they may inflict upon us, and whatever amount of righteous moral indignation their character and conduct may excite. The kingdom of Christ is an ideal kingdom, of men living in the union of love with God and one another; and as that kingdom in any fulness has never existed upon earth, and “is still waiting to be realized,” those who at heart are members of it are always praying and striving that it may come. Active and self-sacrificing tenderness, not only to relieve and comfort man’s painful estate, but by all wisdom and heroism of institutions and of individual action to prevent and forestall human suffering; higher than this, a zeal for the holiness and blessedness, for the strength and life of their souls; and a forgiveness of personal injuries, a love for enemies which in its desire and effort for their good, in its faith of their redemption and salvability, possibly of their innocence, no resentment can disturb;—these are the three forms which “the Enthusiasm of Humanity,” as our author has it, or, as we prefer it, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of God in Man, assumes. The third is evidently included in the other two, and is only a distinctly expressed warning against the sore temptations they may have to encounter, a declaration that there is no case so extreme in the difficulties of its conditions that within it their law may be relaxed, their spirit be excused if it fails to live and act.

The philanthropy that was practicable while Paganism held the political and civil power of the world was rudimentary ; only an united Christendom can exhibit philanthropy in its highest forms both of prevention and of cure,—and it is one aspect of the grandeur of Christianity that it was content to give precepts for the time, along with a spirit that would gradually supersede them by larger previsions and embodiments of love. It is admirably said that those who profess the most literal adhesion to Christ are sometimes the most opposed to the legitimate development and action of his living spirit in the world :

“They think they must needs be most Christian when they stick most closely to the New Testament, and that what is utterly absent from the New Testament cannot possibly be an important part of Christianity. A great mistake, arising from a wide-spread paralysis of true Christian feeling in the modern Church ! The New Testament is not the Christian Law ; the precepts of the Apostles, the special commands of Christ, are not the Christian Law. To make them such is to throw the Church back into that legal system from which Christ would have set it free. The Christian law is the spirit of Christ, that Enthusiasm of Humanity which he declared to be the source from which all right action flows. What it dictates, and that alone, is law for the Christian.”

*** “But, say the cautious, is it safe to follow a mere enthusiasm ? If Christ is to be believed, it is not safe to follow anything else. According to him this Spirit was expressly given to guide men into all truth. But, they will rejoin—and here the truth comes out—we like to feel the stay of a written precept ; we are not conscious of any such ardent impulse directing us infallibly what to do. In reply to which what can we do but repeat the question of St. Paul, ‘Into what then were ye baptized ?’”*

And a like mistake is made by those who confound Christianity with philanthropy, unless that word includes and gives the first place to zeal for the life of the soul. “The Church is more than a sister of charity.” Christ’s most passionate desire was for that spirit in a man which renders him incapable of sin and, like God, he could contemplate undismayed, though not un pitying, any sufferings that issued in the promotion of that spirit. He himself, by refusing to suppress one jot of Truth or Righteousness, deliberately forced on the Pharisees to fill up the measure of their fathers. He

* Pp. 202, 203.

persevered in a course which he knew must bring martyrdom to him and his, and make the whole nation to which he belonged disclose in action, and expiate by suffering, the evil spirit that was in them and that must at whatever cost be cast out. And this interest in the life of the soul made him more merciful than those who were only merciful. His holy love for men kept him from ever despairing of them, gave spiritual hope where benevolence has only pity. The most awful judge of human sin has the deepest belief in the possibility of its recovery. He knows that all things are possible to God, and that it needs but the touch of His spirit to regenerate a soul. And so he holds it as the most blessed power of a good man's life in his intercourse with bad men, to be the medium of that divine contact. Those who have the deepest sense of sin will be, not the most indulgent, but the most merciful towards the sinner; will do most for his salvation while judging him most truly; having the most real knowledge, through their own spiritual consciousness, that it is impossible he should ever be beyond the reach of God.—There is much ingenuity, not to say subtlety, without perhaps much of vital instruction, in the distinctions which the author establishes between the several aspects of the one spirit of Christ, combining as it does the utmost justice with the utmost mercy, a full sympathy with the wrongs and sufferings of the injured along with a full sympathy with the offending sinner for the abused capabilities of his nature and the terrible woes of an evil being. And a full sympathy with the injured and with the injurer implies an absolute moral indignation, a pure resentment, against evil. And the fuller your belief in the salvability of the sinner, that his sin is the utter perversion of his nature, the more absolute will be your moral indignation, your resentment of evil—the less will you permit you or him to come to terms with it as a thing to be tolerated. You may know how it came into existence, and so be willing to make all true excuses for it; but your mercy when at its height will be mercy for the sinner and will include no sufferance of his sin; otherwise it is not mercy but unrighteousness, worldly laxity and unprincipled good-nature. A sinner is to be preserved in the possibility of self-respect, not by looking on his sin as a thing to be endured, but by looking on himself, on the life of his soul, as always recoverable. Christ's

identification of every man's nature with his own rendered the possibility of the conversion of sinners a Belief that admitted of no exception, a universal fact. Resentment is a necessary part of this mercy, a deadly and an indignant protest against the wrong that is corrupting nature. How far this Resentment will only flame out against the sin, or will also smite and scorch the sinner, will depend upon his personal knowledge of the guilt and his wilful yielding to it. The author draws a very fine distinction, we believe also a very true one, between Christ's enunciation of the Law of Forgiveness as modified by a righteous resentment towards the evil and the evil-doer, in case of injuries done to a Christian by those who were not Christians, who were not under the law of Christ's spirit,—and in case of injuries done to a Christian by a Christian, by one who had accepted the law of the spirit and had in a measure, at that time especially, its credit in his keeping. Christ said to the Disciples, according to our author's reading: "If a heathen man who looks upon you as his natural enemy treats you as such, forgive him unconditionally; you know yourself to be a brother to those who do not know that they are brothers to you. If a man who calls himself a Christian Brother treats you injuriously, forgive him on repentance; and if he will not repent before you or before the Church, deliver the infant Church from the falsehood of his presence." Since he knows and professes a law that he will not keep, to shew him that he is self-excluded for the time may be to win him over in the spirit. How else could Christians act towards one another at a time when it was impossible for them to appeal to the civil tribunals, and when the very object of the Christian Church was to exhibit to the world the light of a pure Law of Love? Now the law of the Church and the law of the State is, or ought to be, the same, dictated and administered by the same spirit. There is no exception to the absolute Duty of forgiving injuries upon repentance; but unrepented Sin in its triumph, pride, and blazonry, is not in a condition to be forgiven, though the love of Christ will maintain its pure good-will, and abate no effort for the sinner. Christ's own practice seems to countenance this distinction, in his sorrowful gentleness with Pilate, in his lofty and indignant silence before Caiaphas. Christ was indignant only against legalists and hypocrites, against those who

having no love for goodness pretended to be good, and disfigured the face of God. With these he could enter into no terms. "Woe unto you! you have taken away the key of knowledge, you enter not in yourselves, and those that were entering in you hinder!" They or he must pass away, as spiritual powers, from the earth.

Christ's assumption of authority, his claim to be Teacher, Master, Lord, Example, and King, have in modern times with some led to his rejection, with some to his deification. To the one class they seem inconsistent with humility and freedom from self-consciousness, and therefore proofs of human imperfection; to the other they seem incompatible with human limitations as well as with human modesty, and therefore proofs of the possession of a superhuman nature. But, in fact, Christ claimed to be meek and lowly as well as to be Master and Judge. He knew himself as he knew other men: he knew the place that God had assigned him in the workings of His providence. Is this inconsistent with humility? Must a man necessarily be ignorant of the truth as to himself, his relations to God and to other men, his spiritual rank and office in the world, in order that he may preserve his humility? And if a knowledge of the real facts is compatible with meek dignity, are there no circumstances in which it is indispensable to the full beneficial exercise of a man's office, authority, and personal power, that it should be openly asserted? The fact is that those who find in Christ's personal pretensions a note of imperfection are arguing from their own imperfection, and assuming the impossibility that a perfect man should have existence. The absence of self-consciousness, if self-consciousness is a knowledge of the truth in regard to ourselves, is no element of perfectness, whatever temptation the knowledge of superiority might present to imperfectness. A perfect man could not be ignorant of himself or of his place; and if the place was an unique one, Duty to God would require him avowedly to fill it; and Humility itself would require him to assert the possession of it, and whence it came, that the glory might be with God, not with him. "The Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works." Did Christ's knowledge and assertion of his place ever take the form of personal pride, or restrain his tenderest fellowship with others, with sinners or children, with simple and homely

people? Was he who knew his place in the world, and for the Gospel's sake had to claim it, ever otherwise than lowly before God? What meant the tremblings, the prayers and tears, in the hours before the last great Trial? Was Christ ashamed of these fears of a possible failure? Did he try to conceal them from the eyes of his followers as incompatible with the lofty pretensions he had made for himself? He was meek and lowly, as one always must be whose eyes are lifted upwards, whose communion is with God, whose work ever increasing comes day by day fresh from the Father. It was not Christ, but the Disciples, who fell through self-confidence. An imperfect man may find his self-consciousness conflict with his humility: a perfect man will not be disturbed in any divine attitude or relation by a knowledge of the truth. It would be strange that the highest grace of the soul could not exist in Christ, if he saw himself as God saw him.

The eminent merit of "*Ecce Homo*" is, that, by unanswerable force of statement and of reasoning, it shews that the divine Society which Christ founded cannot be joined in legitimate union to any element whatever that would impair its spiritual catholicity. It is exhaustively the Church of the Holy Spirit; and the permanent function of Christ is in every man to awaken the consciousness of the Spirit. To found a Church, a Fellowship of holy love, upon a creed, an orthodoxy, is an insult to the Spirit. Salvation is the life that is in the soul, the healthy state of the whole spiritual being, when God draws men to Him and to one another, and in so drawing them draws them away from all the power of evil. As we have remarked that the author's method gives in some places, undesignedly, an ethical aspect to his survey, as though Christ and not God was its centre, it is but justice to him to shew by a few sentences from his concluding chapter how deeply he feels the vital truth, without which there could be no Family or Church, that we are God's husbandry and building; that the head-stone is yet not the Architect; that Christians are living stones of a living Temple whose foundation is Christ, but whose Builder and Maker is God.

"As every enthusiasm that a man can conceive makes a certain class of sins impossible to him, and raises him not only above the commission of them, but beyond the very temptation to commit

them, so there exists an enthusiasm which makes all sin whatever impossible. This enthusiasm is emphatically the presence of the Holy Spirit." * * * "This enthusiasm was shewn to men in its most consummate form in Jesus Christ. From him it flows as from a fountain. How it was kindled in him, who knows? 'The abysmal deeps of personality' hide this secret." * * * "It not only existed in Christ in a pre-eminent degree, but the circumstances of his life and death gave him pre-eminent opportunities of displaying it. The story of his life will always remain the one record in which the moral perfection of man stands revealed in its root and its unity, the hidden spring made palpably manifest by which the whole machine is moved. And as, in the will of God, this unique man was elected to a unique sorrow, and holds as undisputed a sovereignty in suffering as in self-devotion, all lesser examples and lives will for ever hold a subordinate place, and serve chiefly to reflect light on the central and original Example. In his wounds all human sorrows will hide themselves, and all human self-denials support themselves against his Cross." * * * "The creative effort which produced that against which, it is said, the gates of hell shall not prevail, cannot be analyzed. No architects' designs were furnished for the New Jerusalem, no committee drew up rules for the Universal Commonwealth. If in the works of Nature we can trace the indications of calculation, of a struggle with difficulties, of precaution, of ingenuity, then in Christ's work it may be that the same indications occur. But these inferior and secondary powers were not consciously exercised; they were implicitly present in the manifold yet single creative act. The inconceivable work was done in calmness; before the eyes of men it was noiselessly accomplished, attracting little attention. Who can describe that which unites men? Who has entered into the formation of speech which is the symbol of their union? Who can describe exhaustively the origin of civil society? He who can do these things can explain the origin of the Christian Church. For others it must be enough to say, 'The Holy Ghost fell on those that believed.' No man saw the building of the New Jerusalem, the workmen crowded together, the unfinished walls and unpaved streets; no man heard the clink of trowel and pick-axe; it descended *out of heaven from God.*"

Every one who has read "Ecce Homo," and to whom the living power of Christianity in the world is the deepest interest of existence, will look eagerly for the promised treatise which is to exhibit the relations of Christ to God, and the Revelation of Eternity, by which he delivered men from the power of Physical Evil, of Nature, and of Death.

J. H. T.

II—ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE, AND THE NECESSITY FOR A NEW ONE.

Notes on the proposed Amendment of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures. By William Selwyn, B.D., Canon of Ely, Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity. Cambridge. 1856.

A Revised English Bible the Want of the Church and the Demand of the Age. By J. R. Beard, D.D. London. 1857.

The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament Revised from Critical Sources; being an Attempt to present a Purer and more Correct Text than the Received One of Van der Hooght, &c. &c. By Samuel Davidson, D.D. 1855.

Novum Testamentum Græce. Editio Octava. Æn. Frid. Const. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ. 1864 (in progress).

THE subject of a new version of the Bible may seem unprofitable and trite, but the thoughtful will not so judge. It is true that it has been discussed more or less fully in periodicals, pamphlets and books, within the last ten years. Yet its many sides and aspects have not been exhausted. That it is important in itself can hardly be denied, for it may be easily shewn that it possesses more significance than most of the questions about which the churches and sects of the land are divided in opinion, and therefore denounce one another. Thus it is of greater moment than the petty details that engage the attention of Convocation every year. It lies at the basis of a correct interpretation of Scripture; and affects the creeds of Christendom more or less intimately. The subject needs repeated attention, especially in a land where conservatism is so strong in its operation not only in secular but ecclesiastical affairs. We have always thought that the English version now in common use should be revised; or that a better should be made by its help. The time for this work is come; and the opposers of it ought no longer to object. That they will do so, however, is no more than natural in the present circumstances of religious affairs in England, amid the apathy and ignorance of some, the fear of others, the unreasoning passions of the many, and the increasing incompetence of those

who might be expected to put themselves at the head of the work—the dignitaries of the Church and the leading men in the Universities. New things have always had their opponents; in the present case, the opponents, a heterogeneous mass prompted by very various motives, are legion.

We propose in the present paper to present the most palpable facts in favour of setting about a new version without delay. It is of little importance whether it be called a *revision* or a *new version*, because the two things coincide in practice. A new version, to be what it ought, should be in effect a thorough revision of the authorized one, retaining all the features of it that comport with fidelity to the original, lucidity and correctness. Good sense alone, apart from other considerations, will lead a translator to depart from the venerable language of the received version as little as possible. The latter will be the basis on which he must work. For this reason, and because there are other excellent versions, a new translation having intrinsic value resolves itself into a *revision*, though it come directly from the original in its incipient state.

The following considerations shew the necessity of it. *First*. The authorized translation was published in 1611, in the reign of James the First. At that time the Hebrew and Greek texts had not been critically edited. Textual criticism had not commenced. Very few MSS. were then known or examined; and those were neither old nor good. The text was in its infantine state. What has criticism not done since then? All its activity and achievements are of a posterior date. The edition of the Hebrew Bible by Van der Hooght, whose text forms the *textus receptus*, had not been issued. Neither had the first Elzevir edition of the Greek Testament, with its *textus receptus*, appeared. It is probable that our English translators used for the most part Plantin's editions of the Hebrew Bible, with the Latin version of Pagninus as corrected by Arias Montanus. They followed Beza and Stephens' Greek texts in the New Testament. How imperfect and faulty these are is known to every critic. They had not the benefit of Buxtorf's Bible (1619), nor of the still more copious and valuable Rabbinical Bible of Moses Ben Simeon (1724, &c.). The great Polyglotts of Paris and London, especially the latter with Castle's accompanying Lexicon, had not then appeared.

The editions of Athias (1661) and Van der Hooght (1705), Jablonski (1699) and J. H. Michaelis (1720), Houbigant (1753) and Kennicott (1776, 1780), were unknown. So were De Rossi's labours. The last two did so much for the criticism of the Hebrew text as to entitle them to the enduring praise of future generations. Kennicott and his coadjutors collated wholly, or in select places, 581 MSS., Hebrew and Samaritan; while De Rossi examined 589 additional ones. Since these important collations little has been done, except Pinner's gleanings from a few Karaite and old copies which, with many others are now at St. Petersburg. Of all such materials no use has been made in any recent translation. The public generally are profoundly ignorant of their contents and value, except in their application to the production of a better text by Davidson, after the method of Griesbach relative to the Greek Testament. In like manner, all the critical collations of Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthæi, Scholz, Lachmann and Tischendorf, are a dead letter to the reader of the English Bible, though they have an important bearing on the text. Indeed, they have altered that text materially. Stephens, Beza and the Elzevir are now discarded; and many readings adopted which would give a different character to the English version were they incorporated with it. Two Greek MSS. alone—the oldest and best, viz. the Vatican and Sinaitic—are of great value in restoring the most ancient readings; and although the text of the former is not yet known perfectly, the greater part of it is given by Tischendorf. In the New Testament upwards of a hundred thousand various readings exist, few of which have influenced the English translation now current. The result of the labours of so many scholars for the last 250 years is lost to the unlettered reader; and the treasure is still confined to the learned. Surely measures should be taken to bring it within the reach of the former. If it be of value, why should he be excluded from the benefit?

Secondly. It is often alleged that the critical collations mentioned have brought to light few readings of importance, and do not essentially change our estimate of the common text from which the English was taken. Here the question turns upon the meaning attached to the word *important*. Do the critical materials suggest or demand important

changes? In our view they do, especially in the New Testament. In any case, the texts of Lachmann and Tischendorf present considerable deviations from the Elzevir one. The various readings given by Kennicott and De Rossi are of less moment, because none but Masoretic copies came under inspection; but even among them several are weighty. Had we a good collation of the St. Petersburg Hebrew collection, there is little doubt that readings more deeply affecting the text would be found. The English version contains passages which are undoubtedly corrupt, because it follows an incorrect text. A few examples will put this in a clear light.

In Psalm xvi. 10, we read, "Neither wilt thou suffer *thine holy one* to see corruption." This is not the textual but the marginal reading. The former is, *thy holy* or *pious ones*, which we know to be the reading of the Masorah, and the true one.

In Isaiah xix. 18, we find, "In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of Hosts; one shall be called, *The City of Destruction*." Here an incorrect word is followed. The translation should be, *Protected City*. In the same prophet, ix. 3, "Thou hast multiplied the nation and *not increased the joy*," should be, "Thou hast multiplied the nation and increased its joy," the negative being incorrect.

In the 100th Psalm, 3rd verse, instead of, "It is he that made us, *and not we ourselves*," the marginal reading or K'ri is the true one, "He made us, *and his we are*."

In Jeremiah xxv. 26, the words, "The king of Sheshach (Babylon) shall drink after them," are spurious and do not belong to the text, as the LXX. and internal grounds shew. In like manner, and on the same authority, Jeremiah xxxix. 4—13, is an interpolated paragraph which does not belong to the original writer. So in Psalm cx. 3, the reading should be, "on the mountains of holiness," for, "in the beauties of holiness."

Passing to the New Testament, the last twelve verses of the 16th chapter of St. Mark's Gospel should be omitted, since they do not belong to the Gospel. So should John vii. 53—viii. 11, containing the story of the woman taken in adultery, which is later than the fourth Gospel. In like manner, the words beginning with, "Waiting for the moving

of the water," and ending with, "whatsoever disease he had" (John v. 3, 4); 1 John v. 7; Acts viii. 37; and Matt. vi. 13, last half of the verse, should be left out as spurious. By virtue of the correct readings, an English version ought to have, in 1 Tim. iii. 16, "*He who* was manifest in the flesh;" *the church of the Lord*, instead of, *the church of God* (Acts xx. 28); "blessed are they that wash their robes," instead of, "*they that do his commandments*" (Revelation xxii. 14); and *by Isaiah*, instead of, "by the prophet" (Matthew xiii. 35). Examples of this nature might be greatly multiplied. A critically edited text would certainly furnish a more correct version in many instances.

Thirdly. The English translation is often incorrect. That it is an excellent one on the whole, generally faithful, often happy in its language; that it apprehends the sense and presents the spirit of the original in the majority of instances, is freely conceded. Much of the praise that has been accorded to it is well merited, though some of its friends are injudicious and extravagant in their laudation. Such language as that of Adam Clarke borders on the absurd: "The translators have seized the very spirit and soul of the original, and expressed this almost everywhere with pathos and energy.....God enabled them to stand as upon Mount Sinai, and crane up their country's language to the dignity of the originals," &c. That a better one could be made in the present day, more correct, more faithful to the original, coming nearer the very words of the sacred authors themselves, is indubitable. The learned men who were employed by King James to revise the Bishops' Bible were excellent scholars in their day. But the world has not stood still since then. Two hundred and fifty years have added much to our knowledge of Hebrew and Greek philology. The languages in which the Bible was written are far better understood now. Ancient versions are better known and in greater number. Critical science has long ago stepped forth from its swaddling clothes and put on the dress of manhood. The version, with all its excellences, has numerous mistakes which mar the sense and often prevent a reader from apprehending the intention of the writers. Hardly a chapter is free from greater or less inaccuracy.

For example: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.

And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." (Gen. iv. 7.) Here the sense of the original is perverted, which runs thus: "If thou doest well, canst thou not lift up thy countenance? But if thou doest not well, sin crouches at the door. Its desire is toward thee, and thou shalt overcome it."

Again, an ordinary reader will be perplexed if he tries to understand the passage (Job xxii. 29, 30), "When men are cast down, then thou shalt say, There is lifting up; and he shall save the humble person. He shall deliver the island of the innocent; and it is delivered by the pureness of thine hands." A faithful version would give this as follows:

If one sinks, thou sayest, Rise;
He helps the cast down.
He saves even him that is not guiltless,
So that he is delivered by the purity of *thy* hands.

The passage expresses the efficacy of Job's prayer not merely for himself, but others whom God helps for his sake. How *an island* has been introduced, it is hard to conceive.

Again, the received version has in Deut. xxxiii. 25, "Thy shoes shall be iron and brass; and as thy days, so shall thy strength be." This ought to be,

Thy bolts shall be iron and brass;
And as thy days, thy rest.

In Psalm xvi. 2, 3, "O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord: my goodness extendeth not to thee; but to the saints that are in the earth and to the excellent, in whom is all my delight." This is far from being correct. The rendering should be,

I say to Jehovah, Thou art my Lord;
My happiness rests only upon thee;
(Associated) with the saints who are in the land
And the excellent, in whom is all my delight.

In the same Psalm, the word *corruption* is wrong (ver. 10). It ought to be *pit*; and never means corruption in the sense of *putrefaction*.

In the second Psalm, the rendering, "Kiss the Son" (ver. 12), is incorrect. It should probably be, "Do homage to the chosen one."

In Psalm lxxxiv. 5, 6, the authorized version has, "Blessed is the man whose strength is in thee; in whose heart are

it should be rendered, "The true light, that lighteth every man, was coming into the world." This is so obvious, that we are utterly amazed at the five clergymen who revised the Gospel according to St. John (1857) leaving the authorized rendering untouched.

In Hebrews vi. 4, 5, 6, the words, "if they shall fall away," are undoubtedly incorrect. Instead of them should stand, "when they have fallen away." A theological bias appears here in following Beza.

In Romans viii. 20, 21, our version has, "For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." This should run thus: "For creation was subjected to vanity—not willingly, but on account of him who subjected it—in hope that the creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption," &c. The mistranslation of a single word (1 Cor. xi. 29) has driven thousands of well-meaning Christians from the holy communion—a fact which should be considered by all who speak of the authorized version being sufficient and satisfactory on all points of importance.

Fourthly. Have not new translations been made? some will ask. Have they not all failed to commend themselves to general acceptance? It is true that various versions have appeared since the year 1611 in the English language, of which the principal are the following.

Anthony Purver, a member of the Society of Friends, made a new version which was published in 1764. A few specimens will shew its nature:

"Thus did God make two great lights; the greater one for the government of the day, and the less for that of the night, together with the stars. Which he had no sooner put in that expanse, to give light upon the earth, and to govern both the day and the night, as well as divide the light from the darkness, but he saw that it was good. It had then been evening, and was morning the fourth day." (Gen. i. 16—19.)

"To be fragrant with the rose of Sharon, fair with the lily of the valleys, are mine. But like a lily among thorns, so is my dear one among the daughters. As an apple-tree amongst the trees of the wood, so is my love among the sons, in whose shade

I should like to sit, and his fruit would be pleasant to my palate. He introduced me to the banqueting-house, the sign of which over me was love. Support me with cordials, strew choice of apples for me ; because I am sick with love." (Song of Solomon, ii. 1—5.)

"Making known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he before proposed in him ; in the stewardship of the fulness of times, to collect together all things in Christ, both those in heaven and those on earth in him ; in whom also we have obtained inheritance, being appointed before, according to the purpose of him who works all things after the counsel of his will ; for us to be to the praise of his glory, that before had hope in Christ : in whom you also had, upon hearing the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation ; in whom too believing, you were sealed with the holy spirit of promise ; which is the earnest of our inheritance, till the redemption to what will be obtained, to the praise of his glory." (Ephes. i. 9—12.)

In 1798-99, David Macrae published anonymously a new version, which is somewhat paraphrastic and explanatory. It is inferior to Purver's, as the following extracts will shew :

"Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth ? Declare, if thou knowest it all. Where is the way of the poles and tropics, where light dwelleth, *largest or least* ? And as for darkness, where is its place with the antipodes, that thou shouldest take it to its bounds, and that thou shouldest know its paths to its hemispheres ? Knowest thou the birth of light because thou wast then born ? or because the number of thy days is great ?" (Job xxxviii. 18—21.)

"Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ (as in baptism ye profess to be) from the elements of the world (ceremonies and rites), why, as if ye were living in (such ages and places of) the world, do ye meddle with these appointments (touch not, taste not, handle not, all which things tend to the corruption (of the gospel) by the abuse thereof), according to the commands and doctrines of men ? Which things have indeed a pretence of wisdom in will-worship, and voluntary humility, and severity to the body, to the dishonourable satisfying of the flesh (and sensual fancy)." (Colossians ii. 20—23.)

Dr. Geddes, one of the best qualified men of his day, an excellent Hebraist and an honest man, had published two volumes of a translation of the Old Testament when death arrested his progress. The first volume, containing the Pentateuch and Joshua, appeared in 1792 ; the second,

from Judges to Chronicles and Ruth, 1797. After his death, the Psalms were given from his papers. It is matter of regret that he should have unwarrantably altered the text, after the Samaritan Pentateuch, the LXX. and other versions.

"Now, while Joshuah remained by Jericho, as he, *one day*, was looking about; lo! a person stood over against him, with a drawn sword in his hand. And Joshuah went up to him, and said to him: 'Art thou for us, or for our adversaries?' He answered him: 'I am come hither, as a chief of the Lord's host.' Joshuah then fell on his face to the earth, and worshiped; and said to him: 'What would my lord say to his servant?' The chief of the Lord's host said to Joshuah: 'Pull thy shoes off thy feet; for the place where thou standest is holy ground.' So Joshuah did." (Joshua v. 13—15.)

"Naomi, her mother-in-law, then said to her: 'I must now seek repose for thee, my daughter, that thou mayest be happy. This Boaz, with whose maids thou hast been, is of our own kindred: lo! this evening he winnoweth barley in the threshing-floor. Bathe thyself then, and anoint thyself, and put on thy *best* raiment, and go down to the threshing-floor: keep thyself unnoticed by the man until he have done eating and drinking: but, as soon as he shall have lain down, thou shalt mark the place where he lieth, and shalt go in, and uncover his feet, and lie down: he will then tell you what thou art to do.'" (Ruth iii. 1—4.)

In 1836, Dr. Boothroyd published his amended version. Inferior in scholarship to Geddes, he fell into the same error of altering the text unnecessarily, after the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint version. The character of his work will be seen by the annexed specimens:

"Simeon and Levi are brethren;
They accomplished by violence their schemes.
Enter not, my soul, into their counsel;
Join not, mine honour, their assembly.
For in their anger they slew the men,
And in their self-will cut off the princes."

(Genesis xlix. 5, 6.)

"The words of the wise are as goads,
Or as nails which are deeply fixed:
The collectors were appointed by one shepherd:
Moreover by these, my son, be admonished:
For in composing books there is no end,

And excessive study is weariness to the body.
 Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter :
 Fear God, and keep his commandments ;
 For this is *the duty* of every man."

(Ecclesiastes xii. 11—13.)

"Yet not as the offence so is the free gift : for if by the offence of one the many have died, much more the grace of God, and the gift which is by the grace of one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto the many. And not as the sentence by one that sinned so is the gift, for the sentence was by one *offence* to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences to justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned through that one, much more shall they who receive abundance of grace and of the gifts of righteousness, reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ." (Ep. to Romans, v. 15—17.)

Dr. Hussey's work, containing a revised version of the Scriptures, appeared in 1844-45. It is easy to see the writer's incompetence for the task which he undertook.

"And she conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man, the very Jehovah." (Genesis iv. 1.)

"And the Philistine said unto David, Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves and stones ? And David said, No, but worse than a dog. And the Philistine cursed David by his gods." (1 Sam. xvii. 43.)

"And after the times seventy seven and threescore and two, Messiah shall cut off from belonging to him both the city and the sanctuary ; Messiah the prince that shall come shall destroy the people, and the cutting off thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of a war, carried on with rapidity, shall be desolations." (Daniel ix. 26.)

The improved version made by Wellbeloved, Smith and Porter, appeared in 1859—1862.

"Ye who ride on dappled she-asses,
 Ye who sit on carpets,
 And ye who walk on the road, sing !
 Without the noise of archers at the watering places.
 There shall they acknowledge the righteous acts of Jehovah,
 The righteous acts of his rulers in Israel.
 Then went down to the gates the people of Jehovah."

(Judges v. 10, 11.)

"But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book,

even till the time of the end. Many shall peruse it *then*, and knowledge shall be increased." (Daniel xii. 4.)

"And Satan stood up against Israel, and stirred up David to number Israel." (1 Chron. xxi. 1.)

Here the erroneous rendering *Satan* is retained.

"Thus the righteous perisheth,
And no man layeth it to heart ;
And merciful men are taken away,
While none considereth that for the evil of *others*
The righteous is taken away.
He entereth into peace ;
They rest in their beds,
Each one who walketh in his uprightness."

(Isaiah lvii. 1, 2.)

Two imperfects are here overlooked, and the translation suffers in consequence.

Dr. Benisch's School and Family Bible was published in the years 1851—1861. The following extracts are from its pages :

"The rod shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come ; and his be the obedience of peoples." (Genesis xlix. 10.)

"A son of fruitfulness is Joseph, even a son of fruitfulness by a well : daughters tread on the wall." (Genesis xlix. 22.)

"A star steppeth out of Jacob, and a rod riseth out of Israel, and pierceth the corners of Moab, and dasheth all the children of Sheth." (Numbers xxiv. 17.)

"All we like the flock have gone astray ; we have turned every one to his own way ; and the Eternal hath caused the iniquity of us all to light upon him. He is pressed and he is humbled, and he may not open his mouth : he was brought as one of the flock to the slaughter, and as a ewe-lamb before her shearers is dumb, so he may not open his mouth. From restraint and from judgment he was taken away and his generation—who reflects on it ? For he was cut off out of the land of the living. Through the transgression of my people came infliction upon them. And he assigned his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death ; although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth." (Isaiah liii. 6—9.)

Mr. Robert Young's new translation appeared in 1863. The subjoined extracts are sufficient to shew the author's incompetence :

"After these things the Word of the Lord hath been with

Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram, I am a shield to thee, thy reward is exceeding great. And Abram saith, Lord Jehovah, what dost thou give to me, when I go barren? and an acquired son in my house is Damascus Eliezer. Abram also saith, Lo to me thou hast not given seed, and lo, a domestic doth heir me." (Genesis xv. 1, 2.)

"Be obedient to those leading you, and be subject, for these watch for your souls, as about to give an account, that with joy they may do this—and not sighing—for this is unprofitable to you." (Epistle to the Hebrews, xiii. 17.)

The fifth edition of Mr. Sharpe's "New Testament translated from Griesbach's Text" is dated 1862. His "Hebrew Scriptures translated," in three corresponding volumes, was published in 1865.

"For I know that my Redeemer liveth,
And that at the last he will rise up over the dust;
And after my skin hath been thus stripped off,
Then out of my flesh shall I see God;
Whom I shall see for myself,
And mine eyes shall behold, and not as a stranger."
(Job xix. 25—27.)

"And unto him who is able to keep you from falling, and to place you in the sight of his glory, faultless with joy, the only God our Saviour, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and throughout all ages; amen." (Jude 24, 25.)

In 1865 was published "The Twenty-four Books of the Holy Scriptures, carefully translated according to the Masoretic Text, after the best Jewish Authorities, by Isaac Leeser."

"And from the time that the continual sacrifice will be removed, even to set up the desolating abomination, there will be a thousand, two hundred and ninety days. Happy is he that waiteth, and attaineth to the thousand, three hundred and five and thirty days. But thou, go (thy way) toward the end; and thou shalt rest, and arise again for thy lot at the end of the days." (Daniel xii. 11—13.)

"Gird thy sword upon the thigh, O mighty one! (it is) thy glory and thy majesty; yea, it is thy majesty: be prosperous, ride along for the cause of truth and meekness and righteousness; and fearful things shall thy right hand teach thee. Thy sharpened arrows—people will fall down beneath thee—(will enter) into the heart of the king's enemies." (Psalm xlv. 3—5.)

We leave our readers to form their own opinions of the merits of the versions now mentioned. Without criticising them individually, it is not unjust to say that the majority are below the mark of goodness or excellence. Those of Leaser, Geddes, Wellbeloved with his associates, and Sharpe, are superior to the rest; though they too are susceptible of improvement, scarcely shewing the exact Hebrew and Hellenistic scholarship necessary to produce a work commanding general attention and approval. All have patent mistakes. The very extracts given, though taken at random, prove this. Mr. Leaser's appears to be the work of a scholarly man, and deserves commendation. In virtue of the author's Hebraistic attainments, greater weight belongs to it than to any other revised English version of the Old Testament since that of Geddes. The labour of seventeen years was not misspent. We are surprised, however, to see the retention of various renderings of the authorized version, such as Gen. xlix. 10, which is certainly incorrect; and the version is too literal to read smoothly. It is unfortunate that the multiplication of new translations or revisions should furnish an argument against the very object they are meant to promote; though the abuse of a thing is not valid against its legitimate use.

Fifthly. The desirableness of a new version will be apparent from what has been already advanced. A much more correct text can now be had in the New Testament, and a better one in the Old. Should not this better text be adopted for removing errors inherent in the authorized version, and producing a close conformity to the original? We admit that the opponents of the work proposed are numerous and noisy. But they belong, for the most part, to the unlearned class; if not, they are timid men, content with things present, and hardly reaching forth to what is beyond. They point to the fact that one text will hardly unite the opinions of scholars; against which we have only to state our belief that the edition of Tischendorf's Greek Testament now in progress (the eighth) may be safely taken as the best, being drawn from the oldest MSS. and other sources. *Real* scholars will scarcely object to it as the best on the whole. As to the Old Testament, that of Theile is the most correct, and should be taken for a basis.

But it is said that translators have generally failed.

None of them has reached the excellence of King James's version. In proof of this, specimens of inferior works are adduced; and then comes the exhortation, "Hold fast by what you have." It must be admitted that most translators have proved their incompetency in some respect or other. They have erred from want of a wide and extensive scholarship, a critical knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, an acquaintance with the best translations in other languages, and a mastery over the English tongue. But it is quite possible that one man may unite in himself these diversified qualifications and attainments. If De Wette has produced an admirable version in German, why could not an Englishman do the same in English? Or if one man be insufficient, why should not several unite for the purpose? The time has fairly arrived for it; and we join issue at once with Bishop Ellicott when he says, "For any authoritative revision we are not yet mature, either in Biblical learning or Hellenistic scholarship." Certainly, the bishops, as such, will not initiate or encourage the scheme, being deficient in learning and occupied with inferior matters. Nor will the Church of England, as a Church divided into many parties, undertake it. A Royal Commission might perhaps organize a body of scholars for the purpose; though there is little doubt that some of the best men would not be selected by it. It is useless to look to dignitaries of the Church or to our present legislators for any real help in the matter. Either a voluntary association must do it, or one man. As to *authoritativeness*, Parliament could command a new version to be used in all Established Churches; but that step would be unwise. Let a better version than the authorized one stand or fall on its own merits. If it be really better, it will gradually win its way into public favour, and procure the place for itself which it deserves. It will supplement and correct, if it does not supplant, King James's. It is surely strange conduct in those who hold what they call *plenary inspiration*, to adhere to words demonstrably not written by the inspired writers themselves; to quote texts that are spurious; to call the entire English Bible *the Word of God*, when it contains many words which ignorant or mistaken men took into the text afterwards; and to cry out against all revision as if it were an invasion of the prerogative of infallibility. Scholars wish to have a new ver-

sion in order that the *ipsissima verba* of the original authors may be presented, as far as they can, to the English reader ; and the advocates of a *plenary* or *verbal inspiration* should be the most anxious to obtain those words, instead of clamouring against every honest effort in that direction.

Testimonies in favour of the scheme are abundant. Let us hear a few known scholars speak on the subject. Bishop Lowth affirms (1778), "that in respect of the sense and the accuracy of interpretation, the improvements of which our version is capable are great and numberless ; and that the expediency of revising it grows every day more and more evident." Archbishop Newcome, recommending an improved English version of the Scriptures, says, that "nothing could be more beneficial to the cause of religion, or more honourable to the reign and age in which it was patronized and executed. The reasons for its expediency are, "the mistakes, imperfections and many invincible obscurities of our present version ; the accession of various helps since the execution of that work ; the advanced state of learning, and our emancipation from slavery to the Masoretic points, and to the Hebrew text as absolutely uncorrupt" (1785). Dr. Blayney says, "A new translation of the Scriptures in our own language for the public service has long been most devoutly wished by many of the best friends to religion and our Established Church, who though not insensible to the merit of our present version in common use, and justly believing it to be equal to the very best that is now extant in any language, ancient or modern, sorrowfully confess that it is still far from being so perfect as it might and should be ; that it often represents the errors of a faulty original with too exact a resemblance ; whilst, on the other hand, it has mistaken the true sense of the Hebrew in not a few places, and sometimes substituted an interpretation so obscure and perplexed, that it becomes almost impossible to make out with it any sense at all" (1784).

Dr. Joseph White (Hebrew Professor at Oxford), in a sermon preached at Oxford, recommending a revisal of the English translation of the Old Testament, says : "Scholars will rejoice to see new accuracy in matters not absolutely essential that are connected with religion ; they will rejoice to see the various emendations and illustrations that have

been generally approved embodied in a new translation. Light will be thrown on many passages and dignity restored to others" (1779).

Dr. Durell (Principal of Hertford College, Oxford) says of the authorized version, that "it does not exhibit in many places the sense of the text so exactly as the version of 1599, and mistakes it besides in an infinite number of instances. Frequently it expresses not the proper subject of the sentence, and adheres at other times so closely to the letter as to translate idioms. It arbitrarily gives new senses to words, omits or supplies them without necessity. And, to sum up all, it has this fault, that it may justly be questioned whether any possible sense can by fair interpretation be deduced from the words in not a few places." He hopes, therefore, that "the very desirable period" for making a new translation may not be far distant (1772).

Professor Symonds, of Cambridge, wrote at length on the expediency of revising the present English version of the New Testament, pointing out many of its ambiguities, errors and defects (1789).

Dr. Waterland says of our translation, that though it is a very good one, it is "undoubtedly capable of very great improvements."

To these names we may add those of Kennicott and Archbishop Secker, who were in favour of revision. Kennicott, writing about a hundred years ago, affirms that "the present English version is so faulty as to make a reformation of it extremely desirable;" and Secker, in his Latin speech intended to have been made at the opening of Convocation in 1761, says, "Novam saltem Scripturæ versionem desiderari plurimis videtur. . . . Et quis refragetur honestissimæ petitioni?" In 1828, Bishop Marsh, who occupies a high place in the theological literature of England, writes: "When we consider the immense accession which has been made since 1611, both to our critical and to our philological apparatus; when we consider that the whole mass of literature, commencing with the London Polyglott and continued to Griesbach's Greek Testament, was collected *subsequently* to that period; when we consider that the most important sources of intelligence for the *interpretation* of the original Scriptures were *likewise* opened after that period, we cannot possibly pretend that our authorized version does not require

amendment." Macknight, in his Preface to the Epistles, goes farther in alleging of our authorized version, that "it is by no means such a just representation of the inspired originals as merits to be implicitly relied on for determining the controverted articles of the Christian faith, and for quieting the discussions which have rent the Church." After these testimonies one from America must suffice, that of the English lexicographer, Noah Webster: "All men whom I have consulted, if they have thought much on the subject, seem to be agreed in the opinion that it is high time to have a revision of the common version of the Scriptures. In my own view, such revision is not merely a matter of expedience, but of moral necessity" (1833).

If such was the opinion of these learned men, has not the case become stronger by time? What they wished for years ago is imperatively required now, in the interests of truth, theology and literature. What has been done in Germany, may and ought to be done in England. Since Luther's version, that country has produced several admirable translations of the Scriptures, proceeding from Jews and Christians. The excellent one of De Wette needs no praise. That of the Roman Catholics, Leander Van Ess and his brother, is good. The Jewish one made under Zunz's superintendence has approved itself to scholars, and commanded a very large sale. Herxheimer's, another Jewish one, is excellent. And that given in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk*, though still incomplete, is conspicuous for fidelity, accuracy and clearness of language. With such examples before us, why should it be thought that England is not ripe for the task? Popular declaimers from the pulpit and ephemeral writers ought not to be heard on such a question. Dealing as they do in language like this, "I assert and maintain that the fifty-four translators of 1611 were the most accomplished scholars in Greek and Hebrew that ever lived, and seem to me to have been raised up in the providence of God for the special purpose of giving us the translation of the Bible as we now have it," they evince ignorance of the subject. Let them "thank God for the old text; thank God for the text of Erasmus and Stevens (sic), and believe it to be the purest and the best;" but let us thank God that he has given us sufficient light to prevent the utterance of foolish things calculated to keep the public in contented ignorance or rooted prejudice.

Sixthly. In carrying out the scheme, certain rules must be laid down and observed. The following, which are in substance those proposed by Archbishop Newcome, appear the best :

1. The language, sense and punctuation of the authorized version should be retained, unless a sufficient reason exists for departing from them. A notable example of the violation of this rule occurs in Henderson's :

"Ho every one that thirsteth, come to the waters,
And he that hath no money, come, *procure* and eat;
Yea, come, *procure* wine and milk,
Without money and without price."

It is also violated by those who translate the Epistle to Romans ix. 3, "for I did wish myself to be separate from Christ," and put the clause in a parenthesis. The authorized version is correct in rendering "I could wish," and no parenthesis is needed. If "myself" were placed a little earlier in the clause, viz. "I myself could wish," the rendering would be most exact.

2. A translator should express every word in the original by a literal rendering, where the English idiom admits of it; and where not only purity, but perspicuity and dignity of expression can be preserved. This is not observed in Psalm cvii. 27, "and are at their wits' end," which ought to be literally given, "and all their wisdom is exhausted."

3. Saxon and simple words should be preferred to Latinized ones; the tastes of educated men and critics being of less moment than the production of a popular translation. This is violated by Henderson's, "that fabricate images," for the authorized version's "makers of idols" (Isaiah xlv. 16).

4. Where the English idiom requires a paraphrase, it should be so formed as to comprehend the original word or phrase; and the supplemental part should stand in italics, except harshness of language arises. Thus we should render Luke ix. 53, "because his face was *as if he were* going to Jerusalem," rather than with Wakefield, "because he was bent upon going to Jerusalem."

5. The same original word and its derivations, as also the same phrase, should be respectively translated by the same corresponding English word or phrase. Thus in Isaiah xxxvii. 3, 4, "This day is a day of trouble, and *of rebuke*

and of blasphemy, &c. It may be the Lord thy God will hear the words of Rabshakeh, whom the king of Assyria his master hath sent to reproach the living God, and *will reprove* the words," &c. As the words in italics correspond in Hebrew, *of rebuke* should be *of reproof*.

6. The collocation of the words should never be harsh and unsuited to the English ear. This is often violated, especially by foreigners who have learnt English, as by Leeser and Benisch. Thus the former has, Isaiah liii. 6, "We all like sheep went astray; every one to his own way did we turn; and the Lord let befall him the guilt of us all." And Mr. Stuart renders Epistle to Romans iii. 21, 22, most unmusically: "But now, the justification without law which is of God is revealed, to which testimony is given by the law and the prophets; a justification then which is of God by faith in Jesus Christ."

7. Metaphors in general should be retained, and the substitution or unnecessary introduction of new ones ought to be avoided. Thus in Isaiah xlv. 8, where our version has, "Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God; I know not any;" Henderson's is superior because retaining the metaphor, "There is indeed no *rock*; I know of none." More elegant is, "Yea, *there* is no rock; I know not *any*."

8. The one sense of each passage should be given, irrespective of the opinions of any denomination of Christians. It must be admitted that "The Improved Version of the New Testament," published nearly sixty years ago, often transgressed this rule. And we observe that Jewish translators are not invariably free from peculiar leanings. Thus Leeser renders Isaiah vii. 14, "Behold, this young woman shall conceive, and bear a son, and she shall call his name Immanuel."

9. The poetical parts should be divided into lines corresponding to the parallelism of the original. Difficulty attends the observance of this rule in the Old Testament; for we object to its introduction into the New, notwithstanding the authority of Jebb and his followers. An intimate acquaintance with the genius and characteristics of Hebrew poetry is required in him who would judiciously distribute parallel lines. Thus Psalm xxxix. 1:

"I said, I will take heed to my ways, that I sin not with my tongue;

I will keep my mouth with a bridle,
While the wicked is before me."

Mr. Sharpe has injudiciously put these three lines into two.

10. Proper names as now written should be retained, unless in cases of exigence. Such a case of exigence is Hebrews iv. 8, where "Jesus" of the authorized text should be "Joshua."

11. No dates should be given in the margin or elsewhere to historical events or books.

12. A new and careful division into larger and smaller paragraphs should be made, without respect to the present chapters; the punctuation should be carefully marked, and the verses be numbered in the margin. Thus Isaiah liv. 1—55, should be one chapter, not two, and should be divided into paragraphs, liv. 1—10; 11—17; lv. 1—7; 8—12. Epistle to Ephesians, i. ii, should be one chapter, with the following paragraphs: i. 1, 2; 3—14; 15—ii. 10; 11—21. It is to be regretted that the "Annotated Paragraph Bible" published by the Religious Tract Society has done so little in this department. No reliance can be put upon it by the reader. Thus it makes Isaiah xxxiii.—xxxv. one large chapter, whereas from chapter xxxiv., &c., belongs to another subject, time and writer. And the first chapter of Titus is separated into three paragraphs instead of *two*. The new headings of books are often erroneous, and the whole work unscholarly.

In the distribution of verses, the words "on the mountains of holiness" (Psalm cx. 3), and "from the womb of the morning," should be separated thus:

"Thy people are willing in the day of thine army, on the mountains of holiness;

From the womb of the morning thy youth come to thee like dew."

So in Psalm xxxi. 10, 11, the first two words of ver. 11 (Hebrew 12) belong to the 10th, and the sense is,

"My bones are consumed because of all mine oppressors."

In the New Testament, John vii. 21, *διὰ τοῦτο* should belong to the 21st verse, "Ye all marvel on account of it." How materially punctuation affects the sense is seen from Blackader's edition of the English Bible, which reads, "Provide

things honest in the sight of all men, if it be possible" (Romans xii. 17).

13. All the headings of the present chapters should be laid aside ; and correct ones, simpler and fewer, ought to be made.

14. The most important various readings of the principal MSS. and versions, as far as any weight attaches to them in their respective places, should be given as briefly as possible in English, at the bottom of the page.

15. Other renderings, whose claims are judged to be nearly equal to those adopted, or which are fairly entitled to attention, should be put in the margin. Thus in Isaiah liii. 11, where the two renderings—"Free from the trouble of his soul shall he see and be satisfied," and, "He shall see of the travail of his soul," &c.—require deliberation in choosing between them, one should be put in the margin—the former, as we think, though Gesenius thinks otherwise. Similarly in John v. 39, the reasons for making *ἐπευῶρε* indicative and imperative are nearly equal. The former seems to us preferable, "ye search."

In the application of these rules, judgment, skill, caution and taste, must be called into constant requisition. The task would be difficult and delicate, especially in the Old Testament, where the text must sometimes be altered *according to the exigence of the place*, even where MSS., versions and other external sources are silent. Disagreeing with Bishop Horsley with regard to this, we should yet apply it very cautiously. To meddle with the text by critical conjecture is hazardous. Yet the thing must be done ; for conjecture is sometimes preferable to the testimony of a few MSS. and incorrect versions. In relation to the exaggerated numbers in the Old Testament, the contradictions between one writer and another speaking of the same thing, and the removal of insuperable difficulties, there is room for great care. It is generally admitted by scholars, that Cappellus and his followers—Houbigant, Lowth and Kennicott—altered the Hebrew text unwarrantably by the aid of the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, Syriac and Vulgate versions, or even by MSS. Geddes followed them. Horsley himself, while disavowing critical conjecture, adopted readings as erroneous as any that conjecture in the hands of a critic would allow.

The pertinency of these remarks will appear if reference be made to 1 Sam. vi. 19, where it is stated that 50,070 men of Bethshemesh were slain, where seventy men alone should be adopted as the true reading, the fifty thousand having been a subsequent interpolation; to 1 Sam. xiii. 1, asserting that Saul was a year old when he began to reign, where the proper number of years might be supplied, the reading being now corrupt; and to 2 Chron. xxii. 2, where we should not disturb *forty and two years*, though they disagree with the *twenty-two* of 2 Kings, because they seem to be original.

Nor is it easy to exclude all theological bias, as the punctuation of the Epistle to the Romans, ix. 5, may shew; where the means available for coming to a decision are almost equally balanced between a full stop after *σάρα* or a mere comma. It is certain that the authors of the received version have shewn their leanings; else *any man* would not have been inserted in Hebrews x. 38, lest the doctrine of the saints' perseverance should suffer. The textual and the higher criticism, the proper work of a translator and that of an interpreter, are sometimes separated by an indefinite line. They often border closely, as is apparent from the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, where the third verse may be rendered, "All things were made *by him*," or "All things were made *by it*;" and from Matthew xx. 23, where many omitting the words supplied by the translators, render, "is not mine to give *except* to those for whom it is prepared,"—contrary to the proper meaning of *ἀλλά*, but conformable to the doctrine of a limited atonement. The same is exemplified by Wakefield's version of *ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν*, in John i. 15, "for he is greater than I;" and in a less degree by Mr. Sharpe's, "for he is my superior;" both renderings being inferior to that of the authorized version, "for he was before me," because the last leaves it indefinite whether the evangelist meant *before* in dignity or in respect to existence. And surely Geddes's translation of Genesis i. 2, "a vehement wind" for "the spirit of God," evinces a naturalistic tendency, and is only less objectionable than "the breath of God," proposed by others. Here the authorized version cannot be altered except for the worse.

S. D.

III.—THE EXPULSION OF THE TRAFFICKERS FROM THE TEMPLE.*

FEW passages in the history of Jesus have caused so much embarrassment to harmonists and commentators as the narrative of his forcible expulsion of the buyers, sellers and money-changers from the temple. An act of this kind is related in each of the Gospels, but with this very material difference, that in the fourth Gospel it is related as the earliest act of his public life, in the other Gospels as one of the latest. The difference is usually accounted for by supposing that each evangelist has told the truth, though not the whole truth, the fact being that Jesus twice performed the act in question—first at the outset of his ministry, as stated in the fourth Gospel, and again when its close drew near, as stated in the synoptic Gospels. But if so, it might surely have been expected that information of the whole truth would be found in one or other of the Gospels, if not in all; for the repetition of so extraordinary a proceeding must have appeared a most memorable feature in the history of Jesus, and it would have been only natural for any well-informed historian who related the later instance of it, to refer or allude to the earlier. Yet in none of the Gospels is there the slightest intimation that the writer knew of more than one instance, and we should never imagine, if we had only the fourth Gospel, that Jesus performed this act of authority at any other time than the outset of his ministry, nor, if we had only the synoptic Gospels, that he performed it at any other time than the close. If it be pleaded that the writers of the synoptic Gospels omitted to notice the first performance, because it occurred in that earliest period of the ministry of Jesus which they have all passed over in total silence, I answer, that this consideration only adds to the difficulty; for if the fact was, as related in the fourth Gospel, that Jesus taught, and gained proselytes, and performed miracles in Jerusalem before he commenced his public labours in Galilee, it is inconceivable how three historians, all of whom must be supposed to have had intercourse with his first fol-

* Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15—17; Luke xix. 45, 46; John ii. 13—17.

lowers, should have concurred in omitting this earliest part of his ministry without even hinting, or appearing to be aware, that they omitted anything of importance. One of these historians, indeed, not only ignores the early Judean ministry of Jesus, but virtually denies it when he states that "from that time (the time when he departed from the wilderness into Galilee, after hearing of John's imprisonment) he *began* to preach, and to say, Repent," &c. (Matt. iv. 17);* and the same statement that he "began from Galilee" is found in the speech of Peter (Acts x. 37), and in the accusation brought against Jesus by the chief priests before Pilate (Luke xxiii. 5). The total silence of the fourth Gospel about the second performance of the act in question may be thought sufficiently accounted for by supposing that Gospel to have been intended only as a supplement to the rest. But that hypothesis, so long accepted, though so perfectly gratuitous, is now admitted to be untenable,† and it certainly does not help us in the present difficulty; for if the writer meant to confine himself to matters unnoticed by the other evangelists, he would have omitted not only the expulsion of the traffickers from the temple, but the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, which yet he has related almost as fully as his predecessors. These two events, as related in the other Gospels, were so closely connected in point of time, that the mention of one might have been expected to lead to the mention of the other. Yet the fourth evangelist, after relating the glad Hosannas which greeted the arrival of Jesus in Jerusalem, ignores his subsequent proceedings in the temple, and tells not even of any visit to the temple afterwards. This was more like

* Dean Alford appears to have forgotten his usual candour in acknowledging the difficulties he is unable to explain, when he says, in his note on this passage, that it means, "*began his ministry in Galilee*," and adds that "the account of Matthew, being that of an eye-witness, begins where his own experience began." If we had only the synoptic Gospels, who would ever have imagined that Jesus had preached in Jerusalem before he began to preach in Galilee? and if the first Gospel was the work of Matthew the publican, whose call is related in the 9th chapter, how can it be said that he "begins where his own experience began"?

† "The Gospel [of John] bears internal evidence of being an original work complete in itself, without direct or indirect relation to any others. It has no discernible supplementary character." (Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. I. p. 323.) Dean Alford also subscribes to this opinion. See his Greek Testament, 5th edition, Vol I., Prolegomena, p. 62, note.

tacitly contradicting than supplementing the earlier Gospels, and certainly gives us reason to conclude that the writer knew of no purgation of the temple in the Passion Week.

Such are the insuperable difficulties which we encounter in supposing that there were two performances of the act in question. Nor do we mend the matter in the least by supposing there was only one; for in that case we have to decide which of the two narratives is the most worthy of belief; and when we find that critics differ on this point, one imputing a chronological error to the fourth evangelist,* another to the synoptics,† we may judge that it is a question which admits of no satisfactory solution. Each narrative, indeed, when narrowly examined, will be found so full of startling improbabilities, that we shall have difficulty in accepting either of them as true history.

The narrative in the fourth Gospel will appear in the highest degree improbable if we consider that Jesus, at the time referred to, must have been a total stranger in Jerusalem. He had never, so far as the history informs us, made his appearance there before. There is no reason to suppose that his baptism by John and the testimony of that person to his superior dignity had made him known to any large portion of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and his subsequent visits to Cana and Capernaum were too brief and too private to give him much celebrity even in Galilee. How was it, then, that this hitherto undistinguished person, coming for the first time to Jerusalem at the passover, could have exercised at once that act of high-handed authority which we find related in the fourth Gospel? How was it that the crowd of traders and money-changers submitted to the arbitrary will of a stranger who was vested with no recognized authority, and tamely allowed him to drive them with stripes from a place which had been theirs by prescriptive right, and where they could not have been conscious that they were doing anything wrong? The practice of holding a market in the outer court of the temple for the sale of such animals as were required for sacrifice had long been established as a needful accommodation to worshippers, and it was equally necessary that money-changers should

* Priestley.

† Neander.

be there to supply worshippers from distant countries with the coinage they wanted for making their purchases and paying the temple dues. That the numbers who were occupied in this customary and lawful business should have submitted to be rudely prohibited from it by one who had no ostensible claim to obedience—that they should have made no resistance when he used his scourge to drive them and their cattle from the court of the temple, and went even to the outrageous length of overthrowing their tables and pouring out their money—is conduct altogether unaccountable and utterly inconsistent with what we know of human nature. Equally at variance is the alleged conduct of Jesus on this occasion with what we elsewhere learn of his character and doctrine. If there is any truth in Paul's appeal to his converts' knowledge of "the meekness and gentleness of Christ" (2 Cor. x. 1), or in the reported declaration of Jesus himself that he was "meek and lowly of heart" (Matt. xi. 29)—if there is any truth in what we read of his frequent praying in the wilderness or on the mountain—if there is any truth in his asserting that "God will have mercy and not sacrifice" (Matt. ix. 13), and that the time was near when all true worshippers should worship the Father in spirit and in truth, and no longer confine their worship to this or that sacred locality (John iv. 21—24)—Jesus was the last person from whom to expect violence in *any* cause, least of all in the cause of a sanctuary which was soon through him to lose its hitherto sacred character. That he who came to establish a universal religion and a spiritual worship should have begun his career by manifesting such excessive zeal and reverence for the temple at Jerusalem, and such unseemly violence against the desecrators of its sanctity, is surely an incongruity that shocks our reason; and what adds still more to the incredibility of the story is the strange and enigmatical answer which he is stated to have given to those who demanded his warrant for doing these things: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up"! (ii. 19). What could his questioners, or his disciples, or any one who heard him, understand by these words? The writer tells us that "he spake of the temple of his body," in allusion to his resurrection. But he admits that even the disciples did not understand the import of the saying till after their Master had risen

from the dead. How, then, was it possible for those he was answering to attach any rational meaning to his words? They could not dream of the event he alluded to. They could only understand him as speaking literally of the temple where they were. Surely no wise teacher of religion, still less a teacher inspired with wisdom from above, could thus have begun his career with an act of violence, and propounded, as his first lesson of religious instruction to mankind, a riddle.

The similar story related in the synoptic Gospels is attended with difficulties quite as great as those pointed out in the story of the fourth. Here the same act is related as occurring in the last week of the life of Jesus, and though it may be presumed that, from his wide-spread fame and unbounded popularity, he could then assume higher authority than at the outset of his career, yet this advantage must have been counterbalanced by the greater opposition he would in that case encounter. For in the narrative we are now to examine it is stated that Jesus drove out from the temple not only those who *sold*, but also those who *bought*, and if so, he must have had to deal with a much larger class of persons than in the case related in the fourth Gospel. There must have been very few in the court of the temple who had not come for purposes either of gain or of worship; that is, there must have been very few who were not either sellers or buyers of animals for sacrifice—either money-changers or persons who wanted their money changed; and to cast out both classes must have been to clear the temple-court of almost all its occupants. It is difficult, indeed, to imagine how Jesus could distinguish those who had not bought, but intended to buy, from those who came for no such purpose, and the only sure way of expelling sellers and buyers both must have been to drive out all who were there without distinction. This would hardly have been endured even from such a person as Jesus, and at any rate he could not in such case have had that support from popular sympathy and approval which is supposed by some to have aided him in his task. Be it also remembered that the great popular demonstration which is described as preceding the act we are considering must have roused opposition from another quarter than that of the traffickers more immediately concerned; for the Romans had at this time

a strong garrison in the castle of Antonia, which overlooked and communicated with the temple, and it was one of the special duties of that garrison, as we learn from Josephus, to keep strict watch over the multitudes which filled Jerusalem at the great festivals, and to prevent any innovation that might be attempted or any tumult that might threaten to arise.* How unlikely, then, that, in the face of this military force, such proceedings as the Gospels relate in close connexion with the clearing of the temple should have been allowed to pass without interference! The triumphal entry of Jesus into the city, attended by a multitude who openly proclaimed him king and paid him kingly honours, must have appeared to the commander of the Roman garrison nothing less than an act of open rebellion, to be put down promptly with the strong hand. And even supposing him to have allowed this procession, it is very certain that he would have closely watched the subsequent proceedings of a person thus honoured by the Jewish populace, and it is hardly likely that he would have been a passive spectator of that act of violence which immediately ensued. We may judge what would have happened on such an occasion by what we are told of "the chief captain of the band" when all Jerusalem was in an uproar about the introduction of Greeks into the temple by Paul. Immediately, we are told, he took soldiers and centurions and ran down to quell the tumult, and thus Paul's enemies, who had seized and were beating him, were compelled to desist (Acts xxi. 31, 32). A like tumult must surely have arisen from the violent expulsion of the buyers and sellers from the temple, and similar, doubtless, would have been the interference of the Roman commander on that occasion.

In one of the narratives of this transaction it is stated that Jesus, besides casting out the sellers and buyers from the temple, laid down for every one's observance a rule for the future. "He would not," we are told, "suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the temple" (Mark xi. 16). By what means, we are here led to ask, was this rule for the future to be enforced, and how long was it effectual? To enforce it for that one day was of no avail, unless there was an authority which would continue to

* Jewish War, ii. 12, 1, v. 5, 8.

enforce it, and where was that authority to be found when Jesus was no longer on the spot? The Jewish authorities, so hostile to Jesus, were not likely to enforce the rule, and the people could hardly be expected to obey it without the continued presence and supervision of him who prescribed it. But Jesus, according to the history, never visited the temple afterwards, and he must have known that this would be the case, if he was aware, as we are told he was, of his approaching end. Where, then, was the use of laying down a rule which he could not expect to be observed when he was gone? This difficulty, indeed, belongs to the whole proceeding; for the stoppage of the temple market on one day was useless if the stoppage was not to be permanent, and we do not read of any means which Jesus took to make it permanent. What, then, was the use of an act which could have had no lasting effect? And where was the wisdom of Jesus if he acted, as this narrative leads us to suppose, from the mere impulse of the moment? Where, we may further ask, was his consistency, if, while censuring the Scribes and Pharisees for multiplying burdensome observances unauthorized by Scripture, he at the same time sanctioned that silly refinement of the same school which made it a desecration of the temple to carry a wallet or a basket through its precincts, or even to enter them with a staff?

Not only, however, is a rabbinical refinement, but something very like rabbinical trifling with Scripture, imputed to Jesus on this occasion; for to the buyers and sellers whom he ejected from the temple he is represented as saying, "It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves" (Matt. xxi. 13). The first part of this quotation is from the prophet Isaiah (lvi. 7), and a perusal of that passage in connexion with the context will show that the writer is there anticipating a time when the Lord God, who gathereth together the outcasts of Israel, will gather others unto him, besides those that are (already) gathered (ver. 8), and say, "Also the sons of the stranger that join themselves to the Lord, to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, and to be his servants—every one that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it and taketh hold of his covenant;—even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings and

their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar, and my house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations" (vers. 6, 7).^{*} It is evident that the last three words, "for all nations," are the words which contain the very gist of the passage, for the prophet is speaking, not of the temple as a house of prayer in contradistinction to a sacred place desecrated by being used for unholy purposes, but of a house of prayer *for all nations* in contradistinction to one frequented only by the *Jewish people*, and his assertion is, in the name of Jehovah, that the burnt offerings and the sacrifices of the sons of the stranger who join themselves to the Lord, will be as acceptable upon his altar as those of the chosen people. Now these important words are wanting in the quotation as given in the first and third Gospels. They are found, indeed, in the second Gospel; but they seem inappropriate to a sentence, the very point of which is the antithesis between a house of prayer, as the temple was meant to be, and that den of thieves to which it was converted. The words, "den of thieves," are supposed to be borrowed from Jeremiah vii. 11, "Is this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes?" The context will show that the prophet is here remonstrating in the name of Jehovah with those of his countrymen who, while they were guilty of stealing, of murder, of adultery, of perjury, and even of idolatry, affected a zeal for the temple of Jehovah, and imagined that such zeal would cover, or make amends for, their nefarious practices. If we are to understand, by the words being borrowed from this passage, that the case which called forth the prophet's remonstrance was parallel to the case which Jesus dealt with, there was surely much unfairness in the comparison, and Jesus was acting contrary to his own warnings against rash and severe judgment in stigmatizing as a band of thieves or robbers all concerned in this temple traffic. Thus to condemn with indiscriminate severity, and thus to trifle with and garble Scripture in order to wrest from its words a pungent sarcasm, was surely unworthy of such a teacher; and who that venerates the name of Jesus would not rather reject the story as a fable than impute to him such deeds and words as these?

^{*} As in the Septuagint.

No explanation of the story which has been offered has the slightest claim to be considered satisfactory. This act of Jesus, it is said, was the fulfilment of that prophecy which speaks of the Lord coming suddenly to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, the day of whose coming none may abide (Mal. iii. 1—3). But this so-called prophecy, when examined with the context, will be found to relate to a judgment which was to be executed on the sons of Levi, who in the time of Malachi had robbed Jehovah of his tithes and offerings (ver. 8), and permitted foreign marriages (ii. 11) and other irregularities. It has nothing, therefore, to do with the expulsion of the traffickers, and is not appealed to as prophetic of that event either by Jesus or the evangelists. It is further said, by way of explanation, that Jesus put a stop to the temple market because the voice of the traders disturbed and interrupted those who were worshipping God in the temple, and that the frauds and impositions there practised led to frequent brawls, by which the temple was profaned, and the guilt of which was shared in by the priests, who allowed this profanation for their own gain. But all this is purely conjectural, no such reasons for the act being assigned in the history; and the right way, surely, to correct such abuses would have been to provide a more suitable place for the market, which we do not read of Jesus attempting. The only approach to a rational explanation of this transaction is that we find in the "New Life of Jesus," by Dr. Strauss, who supposes that Jesus "took offence at the cheating which went on with the business of trading and exchanging," and was disgusted with what he saw of "all this material sacrificial system," and that his displeasure "*betrayed him into that act of prophetic zeal*," of which we read in the Gospels.* It is surely a reflection upon the wisdom of Jesus to suppose that he was betrayed by a sudden impulse into an act of zeal which was very ill calculated to promote his purpose, and which was certainly much misunderstood by his disciples, if it reminded them of the Scripture saying, "*The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up*" (John ii. 17). Still there is some reason in Dr. Strauss's view, and some foundation of truth in the story, if we take it as a piece of history converted

* English Translation, Vol. I. p. 292.

by traditional misrepresentation into legend. Let us see if we cannot find in the phraseology of the New Testament some better explanation of the narrative before us, which will be more consistent with our idea of Jesus.

From many passages in Paul's Epistles, we learn that it was customary with the early Christians to use the name of Christ as a short and convenient expression for Christian doctrine or the Christian religion. Thus, in 1 Cor. xv. 18, he alludes to those who "are fallen asleep in Christ," meaning those who had died in the Christian faith. He tells the Galatians that as many of them as had been baptized into Christ had "put on Christ" (iii. 27), that is, had assumed by baptism the name, and become entitled to all the privileges, of Christians. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, he expresses himself as if they had actually heard Christ, where his meaning evidently is that they had been taught the truths of Christianity (iv. 20, 21). So also the Colossians, having "received Christ Jesus the Lord," are exhorted to "walk in him," that is, to conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the Christian faith in which they had been instructed (ii. 6). Being "in Christ" is a common phrase in the Epistles for being a Christian, and we frequently meet with such expressions as being "established in Christ," being "babes" or "wise in Christ," "instructors or helpers in Christ," "spiritual blessings in Christ," "truth in Christ," "consolation in Christ," and "good conversation in Christ," where the name Christ is evidently used to signify the Christian faith or doctrine. Bearing in mind this very natural application of the word Christ, let us now advert to what we know, from indisputable testimony, to have been one of the earliest and most signal effects of the spread of Christianity. From the well-known letter of the younger Pliny to the emperor Trajan, it appears, that very early in the second century such numbers had embraced the Christian faith in the provinces of Pontus and Bithynia, which Pliny governed as proconsul, that the temples there had become almost deserted, so that the sacred rites had been neglected, and those who sold victims for sacrifice found very few buyers.* There is no reason to suppose that the Christians were more

* Plinii Epistolæ, lib. x. epist. 97.

numerous in those provinces than in many other parts of the Roman empire, and wherever they abounded in the same degree, that is, as may fairly be presumed, in all the extensive regions of Syria, Asia Minor and Greece, where Christian churches had been established, the desertion of the great temples, the neglect of sacrifices, and the lessened sale of victims, must have been equally observable. Wherever this was the case, it would be a common remark that the new religion had emptied the temples and ruined the trade of those who resorted to them for purposes of gain. All the great temples in ancient times were frequented, not only by crowds of worshippers, but by numbers of traders of all sorts, who came as dealers and hawkers come to a fair, or as persons of the same class now flock to Mecca at the time of the great Mussulman pilgrimage to the Kaaba. Among these traders, the changers of money and the dealers in such animals as were wanted for sacrifice were likely to be the most numerous class, and therefore likely to be more particularly mentioned as sufferers from that desertion of the temples which the spread of Christianity occasioned. When the accustomed temple no longer promised them a good market, they would cease to visit it, and when this was noticed, what more natural than to remark the fact by saying that Christ had driven the traders and money-changers from the temple? It was only saying in more lively and figurative terms that Christianity had ruined their hitherto profitable trade, and driven them to seek customers and business elsewhere.

But how, it will be asked, could such a figurative expression have ever been understood literally, and given rise to such a story as that we find in the Gospels? Facts, I answer are not wanting to show that similar misunderstandings or perversions of figurative language have been a not unfrequent source of legendary story. Among a rude and uncritical people there is always a strong propensity to personify or symbolize abstract ideas, and many of the stories of ancient mythology have been traced to this source.* In the dark ages it frequently led to the strangest perversions of historical truth, one instance of which may be mentioned in the words of a late distinguished writer.

* See Keightley's *Mythology*, p. 5.

"Richard L., the most barbarous of our princes, was known to his contemporaries as the Lion, an appellation conferred on him on account of his fearlessness and the ferocity of his temper. Hence it was said that he had the heart of a lion, and the title *Cœur de Lion* not only became indissolubly connected with his name, but actually gave rise to a story repeated by innumerable writers, according to which he slew a lion in single combat. The name gave rise to the story, the story confirmed the name, and another fiction was added to that long series of falsehoods of which history mainly consisted during the middle ages."*

This fiction appears to have been known to Shakspeare, who, in his play of King John, makes Philip the Bastard thus speak to his mother, Lady Faulconbridge:

"Needs must you lay your heart at his dispose,
 Against whose fury and unmatched force
 The awless lion could not wage the fight,
 Nor keep his princely heart from Richard's hand.
 He that perforce robs lions of their hearts
 May easily win a woman's." Act i. Scene 1.

The same cause has largely operated in falsifying ecclesiastical history. The apostle John, James the Less and Mark, are represented by ecclesiastical writers as bearing the insignia and performing the functions of the Jewish high-priest, and these representations are very reasonably considered by Dr. Stanley as matter-of-fact expositions of the strong figurative language which had been used to express the sanctity of these founders of the Christian Church.† The story related by Tertullian and others of John being thrown into a caldron of boiling oil and coming out of it unhurt, is also considered both by Stanley and by Mosheim‡ as having probably originated in some strong figurative language concerning the sufferings and dangers he had survived, which was construed by Tertullian in a literal sense. This tendency to interpret figurative language in a literal sense was exemplified in the custom of the Pharisees, alluded to in Matt. xxiii. 5, of wearing on the forehead and the left arm strips of parchment inscribed with certain texts from Scripture, a custom which arose from

* Buckle's History of Civilization in England, Vol. I. p. 275.

† Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age, p. 282.

‡ Commentaries on the Affairs of Christians before the Time of Constantine the Great, Vol. I. p. 191.

a superstitious anxiety to obey to the very letter the command of Jehovah to the Israelites, to lay up his words in their heart and in their soul, and to bind them for a sign upon their hand, that they may be as frontlets between their eyes (Deut. xi. 18; Exod. xiii. 9). It is also exemplified even at the present day in Abyssinia by the manner in which the Abuna or chief bishop of the Abyssinian church ordains candidates for priestly orders. Besides laying his hands on the candidates and bestowing on them the sign of the cross, he also *breathes on them*, according to the literal meaning of the word "inspiration;" and it is stated by a recent traveller in that part of Africa, that a certain bishop inflated a leathern bag for the ordination of priests in a distant country which he could not visit in person.* In some instances abstract ideas have been exhibited to the eye in symbolical pictures, as in paintings which represent the holy Jesus with beams of glory surrounding his head, or acting the part of a good shepherd carrying his lambs in his arms. An artist even of our own day has painted a figure holding a lantern as a representation of "Christ the Light of the world;" and we are told by the late Mrs. Jameson of a picture in a church at Assisi which represent St. Francis supporting with his shoulders the tottering walls of the Lateran, as seen by Pope Innocent III. in a dream, which induced that pontiff to give St. Francis a full dispensation to preach and establish his order of monks.† Another picture, of which Mrs. Jameson has given a sketch, represents the story of St. Antonio of Padua, who, being called upon to preach the funeral sermon of a very rich man remarkable for his avarice, chose for his text, "Where the treasure is, there will the heart be also," and, instead of praising the dead, denounced him as one condemned for his misdeeds to eternal punishment. "His heart," he said, "is buried in his treasure chest: go seek it there, and you will find it." Whereupon, adds the story, the friends and relations going to break open the chest, found there the heart of the miser amid a heap of ducats; and this miracle was further established when, upon open-

* *Travels, Researches and Missionary Labours in Eastern Africa*, by Dr. Krapf, pp. 36, 49. Compare this with John xx. 22.

† *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, pp. 253, 273.

ing the breast of the dead man, they found his heart was gone.*

These examples may suffice to show that it is no uncommon thing, at least in ecclesiastical history, to find abstract ideas or figurative language represented literally either in words or pictures; and it may now seem not at all impossible that, when the ruin of the temple markets through the spread of Christianity was expressed by saying that Christ had driven the traders from the temple, this expression, in passing down by oral tradition, may at length have been taken literally, and construed as the statement of a personal act of Jesus in the temple of Jerusalem.

It may be thought, perhaps, a fatal objection to this interpretation of the story, that the temple of that city which was the birthplace of Christianity, instead of being deserted like the temples alluded to by Pliny, continued to be frequented by crowds of worshippers even to the time of its destruction by the Romans. It is indeed stated by Josephus that the multitude congregated in Jerusalem at the time it was besieged by Titus amounted to the enormous number of 2,700,200, and that the greater part were strangers who had come from all the country to the feast of unleavened bread.† But that a city less than three miles in circuit should contain a multitude almost equal to the present population of London was simply impossible, and Josephus belies his own testimony in this case by his statement of what happened four years earlier, and at a time when the Jews had gained a temporary advantage over the Romans under Cestius Gallus. If even at that time "many of the most eminent among the Jews swam away from the city as from a ship which was going to sink,"‡ how can it be believed that afterwards, when the surrounding country was occupied by the Romans, and the capture of the city must have seemed more imminent than ever, numbers flocked into it from all parts, as if no enemy was near? Thus much, however, may be said with truth, that the temple at Jerusalem, while it stood, was not likely to be affected by the spread of Christianity to the same degree as the temples out of Palestine. These were shunned by Christians because

* *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, p. 296.

† *Jewish War*, vi. 9, 3.

‡ *Ibid.* ii. 20, 1.

they were temples dedicated to idols, and often made the scene of banquets which were prohibited to Christians on account of their consisting of meats offered to idols. There was no such reason for their shunning the temple at Jerusalem, and we read in the book of Acts how the apostles themselves continued to frequent the temple for the purpose of prayer or in fulfilment of a vow. It was not at all likely, then, that the saying, supposed to have given origin to the story under consideration, was ever a common saying in Palestine; and if we had reason to believe that the traditions about Jesus were all confined to Palestine, the hypothesis here offered would have little plausibility. But the probability is that, even so early as the time of Paul, the Christians of Palestine were far outnumbered by those of Syria, Phœnicia, Asia Minor and Greece, who would all be equally inquisitive about the history of Jesus, and equally prone to circulate traditions of what he said and did. To them the fact would be familiar that Christianity had caused a sensible diminution in the numbers who flocked to the great temples, and it was therefore among them that the saying by which we suppose this fact to have been expressed was most likely to become current, and then to have been misinterpreted or misapplied in the way suggested. How this happened may easily be supposed; for the Christian churches established in the first century in all these countries included a greater or less proportion of Jewish converts, whose minds retained a lingering fondness for their ancient institutions and their national sanctuary, and to them the saying that Christ had expelled the traffickers from the temple would seem as fitting and as true for the temple of Jerusalem as for any heathen temple, though in a different sense. It would appear suitable to their idea of the Messiah to presume that he had exercised authority in the house of God, and vindicated its sanctity by forbidding it to be made the scene of mercantile transactions, and it is no unusual thing for tradition to convert its presumptions into historical facts. It may be supposed, moreover, that the original narrative which arose from this presumption was merely some such simple statement as we find in the third Gospel, without mention of unseemly acts of violence, which may have been added afterwards; and, thus related, the imputed act of Jesus would appear not inconsistent with

his lessons of meekness and spiritual religion, but virtually a protest, though not a violent protest, as Strauss considers it, against "the gross materialism of the sacrificial service." Thus understood, the narrative would agree in spirit, though not historically, with that saying concerning the emptying of heathen temples which we suppose to have been used to express the triumph of Christianity over the ancient cultus ; and if there was a mistake in relating as a personal act of Jesus what was in reality the effect of his religion in after times, it is only one instance, among others which might be mentioned, of the manner in which his history has been made the reflex of the history of the primitive church.

This interpretation of the story here considered cannot certainly be accepted without impairing our confidence in the Gospels, and compelling us to acknowledge that they are a very insufficient evidence for miracles. But it will not entirely destroy their credibility, and if we read them with due care to eliminate their truth from the accretions of tradition which have gathered around it, we shall be led to form a more consistent and satisfactory idea of the character and work of Jesus as a great moral reformer, who, without assuming divine authority or exercising supernatural powers, contributed, by his exposure of formalism and ritualism, and his earnest recommendation of the religion of the heart and life, to bring about that reformation of religious worship, which was a most important step towards the improvement of mankind. It was he who abolished, or had the largest share in abolishing, local worship in great national temples, with all its concomitants of gathered crowds from places far and near, of gorgeous processions, bloody sacrifices and sacerdotal pretensions, and brought home to the doors of all his followers that simpler, purer, more practical and edifying worship, which was calculated to mend the heart and enlighten the conscience. The way, indeed, was prepared for this change by the establishment of synagogues in all places where the widely dispersed Jewish people had settled, and by those lessons of practical and spiritual religion which were there read from "the law and the prophets." But it was by means of his teaching and that of his apostles that the synagogue became transformed into the Christian Church, and in proportion as Christian churches multiplied, temple worship, with all its

sensuous and often demoralizing practices, ceased, and religious services of prayer, and sacred song, and edifying instruction, were introduced, which gradually ripened, though with many drawbacks, into our Christian services of the present day. That these improved services admit of and need further improvement, is only in the natural course of things. Christianity is essentially a religion of progress, and progress is now more than ever the requirement of the day. It was the part of its Founder to substitute for the law of ordinances the more rational worship of the heart and life. It is ours to supplement his lessons of love to God and love to man with the grand revelations of modern science, and so to advance to that more comprehensive faith and higher worship which belong to the God of universal nature.

WILLIAM JEVONS.

IV.—RITUALISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

1. *The Directorium Anglicanum. Being a Manual of Directions for the Right Celebration of the Holy Communion, and for the Performance of other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the ancient Use of the Church of England.* Second Edition. Revised by the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L. London: T. Bosworth. 1865.
2. *The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments. A Translation of the First Book of the Rationale Divinorum Officiorum.* By William Durandus. With an Introductory Essay, by J. M. Neale, M.A., and Benjamin Webb, M.A. London: Rivingtons. 1843.
3. *The Divine Liturgy. A Manual of Devotions for the Sacrament of the Altar, from Ancient Sources.* Edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A. London: Masters. 1863.
4. *Devotions for Holy Communion, taken from the Paradise for the Christian Soul. Adapted to the Use of the English Church.* London: J. H. Parker. 1848.
5. *The Words of the Hymnal Noted, with the Appendix revised and greatly enlarged.* London: J. G. Palmer, 32, Little Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

6. "*Ritualism and the Ecclesiastical Law.*" *Contemporary Review*, January 1866. London: A. Strahan.
7. *A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the Bishop of Exeter.* London: J. Murray. 1850.
8. *A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, on the Present State of the Church.* By Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter. London: Murray. 1851.
9. *Parochial Sermons.* By John Henry Newman, B.D. London: Rivingtons. 1845.
10. *Sermons on Subjects of the Day.* By J. H. Newman, B.D. London: Rivingtons. 1844.
11. *A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon.* By J. H. Newman, D.D., of the Oratory. London: Longmans. 1866.
12. *A Letter to Archbishop Manning on the Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work.* By the Very Rev. F. Oakley. London: Longmans. 1866.

IN a few cheerful sentences the "Times" has dismissed the recent development of Anglican ritual as a passing outbreak of childish eccentricity, while the more sagacious "Spectator" has been content to stigmatize it as a rebellion on the part of the clergy against their superiors "grounded only on the claims of dress."

No misapprehension could be more complete. All that has happened yet, with much more that we may witness hereafter, is the inevitable result of principles held (if not openly avowed) by thousands both of the clergy and laity in the Establishment, who loudly condemn extravagances which are likely, as they phrase it, to vex the peace of the Church. It is the logical outgrowth of a belief which is struggling for mastery over the human mind, and which would be strengthened rather than repressed, if every rite and ceremony most prized by ultra-sacerdotalists were forbidden under stringent penalties. The source of the evil lies deeper; but although no proscription of outward forms can lessen its vitality, there is yet an effectual mode in which it can be reached and killed, not indeed in any branch or portion of that which styles itself the Catholic Church, but in a society which is simply the State in its religious capacity.

It is, however, absurd to suppose that the question can

be brought nearer to its settlement by attributing to the persons charged with these novelties or restorations motives which they disavow, or by ignoring the convictions in obedience to which they profess to act. When the ritualists tell us that they do not care for fine clothes and gaudy colours, for crowds of candles and clouds of incense, that their hearts are not set on grand buildings and curiously-wrought furniture,—we are bound to believe them. The history of the last thirty years bears out their assertion only too forcibly. The movement, be it good or bad, is no mushroom growth. The ritualistic school has not sprung up in a night, and it is not likely to die in a night. Its root is Catholic theology, and its branches are twined round the pillars of Augustine's city of God.

To the man who believes that there is in the world a society divinely organized, with a priesthood deriving its powers in unbroken succession from the Divine Founder himself, that this society is in possession of actual truth which it is empowered to set forth in infallible creeds, and that to its decrees the human mind owes implicit submission,—the assertion that mankind learns the truth slowly and with difficulty, that no religious body whatsoever is in possession of actual truth, that each man is justified in demanding evidence for every proposition, and that there is no sin in honest error,* is the worst of all imaginable blasphemies.

To the man who sees in the history of the Christian Church the movements of conflicting forces, hating each other, anathematizing each other, and deluging the world with blood,—who discerns in the so-called Church Catholic a society boasting of principles directly opposed to the method of physical science and the first axioms of political economy,—the authority of a body which treats men as beings degraded by a "great aboriginal catastrophe" and trembling on the verge of hell, can appear only as the greatest delusion and the most frightful scourge that has ever plagued mankind. To such a man it is manifest that freedom of thought and speech can be secured only by an impartial civil law, that only before a tribunal of the State

* Lecky, *History of Rationalism*, Vol. I. ch. iv.;—*Westminster Review*, Oct. 1865, p. 237.

can he be justified in affirming that the books which bear the name of Moses were never written by Moses, that the legislation ascribed to him was never a reality, that the prophecies are for the most part *ex post facto* narratives, that the history of the Jewish Exodus is scarcely less mythical than the tale of the Dorian migration. The liberty to assert this cannot, he knows, be granted to him in any society or sect which proposes to maintain the traditional faith of Christendom, because the assertion of these propositions cuts away the foundations of that faith, and sets aside the notion of apostate angels luring men into sin and dragging them away into endless torments, as a lying insult to the nature of God. Yet to this liberty he clings as the indispensable condition for a healthy social growth, and as the basis on which the great fabric of modern law and civilization has been reared.

Between these several convictions a great gulf intervenes; and perhaps they only who have crossed it may be able to do justice to the motives and aims of the contending parties. The writer in the "Spectator,"* who speaks of the ritualistic movement as "a revolution expressly to assert the right to wear sweet things in vestments," has never known that state of mind through which Dr. Newman and Archbishop Manning once passed, and in which Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble and Archdeacon Denison still remain.

I make no apology, therefore, for a retrospect which may exhibit in some degree the character of an autobiography. Time alone separates us indefinitely from our old selves; but it is well to remember that theories which have lost their influence over our minds still retain their power over others, and it is not easy to forget the thrill of thankful and determined resolution which we may have felt on first awakening to the belief that we were members of the great society which Athanasius and Ambrose, Gregory and Hildebrand, led on to victory.

It was to this belief that some English Churchmen were awakened when they found that the emotional religion of the so-called Evangelical school was but a few steps nearer than the drowsy indifference of the last century to the Sacramental system of Catholic Christianity. And unques-

* February 17, 1866.

tionably it was an emancipation from a dreary round of unprofitable questions and bootless excitement for all who felt that they need no longer weary themselves with asking, "Am I converted? Am I a new man now, contrasted with what I was last week or last year? Can I point to the hour and minute of my conversion? Can I say positively that my sins have certainly been forgiven?" The Catholic faith imposed no such anxieties on those who were doing their duty as baptized Christians. The great change had passed over all in the laver of regeneration; the grace then given would be continued to them in increasing measure to their lives' end, and if they stained their baptismal robes a return to their former blessedness was open to them through the path of penitence. The spiritual life imparted in and by baptism could not be extinguished except by the commission of the unpardonable sin, or unless they died in a state of impenitence. But as this life was imparted by a sacrament, so by a sacrament only could it be sustained and strengthened; and only by a priesthood whose unction had been imparted by the hands of Christ himself could those sacraments be efficaciously administered.

Thus before the clergy and the laity who accepted this faith a path was opened, of which they could but dimly see the ending. For emotional excitement they had substituted the idea of active duty, while the subjective devotion of prayers, hymns and Scripture readings had become subordinate to the priestly celebration of the great ordinance in which was imparted the true food of the soul. The foundations of ritualism were laid; but some time must yet pass before the conclusions involved in the premisses could be brought vividly into light. The first evil to be encountered and overcome was the intolerable frigidity to which Puritan theories had reduced the services of the Church of England generally, and a reform in the conduct of Morning and Evening Prayer demanded naturally the first consideration. It was manifestly useless to bring the Eucharistic Sacrifice prominently before people from whose minds the very idea of worship had well-nigh vanished away. The first thing, then, to be done was to teach them that in entering the Church they entered the palace of the King of kings, where His appointed ministers offered to Him praise and thanksgiving in His more immediate presence.

Into this sanctuary they came not for mere self-edification, not merely to pray that they might become more truthful, sober, charitable and forgiving, more humble and self-denying, but to offer a service which can be adequately described only as a *cultus*. The idea was very imperfectly carried out; the theory was yet little more than in embryo; but the position was clearly laid down which severed the worship of the Anglican Church from any devotional service which had simply the spiritual profit of the worshipers for its object. This ritualistic character of the Anglican services was earnestly impressed upon the clergy of the diocese of Exeter by a prelate not famed for extravagant love of ceremonial display in his own person. While yet smarting under the recent sting of the Gorham decision, Bishop Philpotts was careful to remind them "that the common prayer of the faithful being not primarily nor chiefly designed to edify man, but to worship God, and God having been pleased to reveal to us something respecting the worship of Him in heaven,—that it is formal, ceremonial, aye, and musical, choral, antiphonal,—divine worship upon earth ought to be a representation, after our poor measure, of what we read of the worship of the heavenly hosts."*

On this ground alone it became a duty to make the place of God's honour glorious; nay, a solution was thus offered for a difficulty which had especial weight in a country so wealthy as our own. When Englishmen have misgivings about the application of riches for selfish gratifications, they quiet them, said Mr. Newman, by asking, "What is the use of all the precious things which God has given us, if we may not enjoy them?" The true answer is,

"Give them to God. Render them to Him from whom and through whom and to whom are all things. This is their proper destination. Is it a better thing to dress up our sinful bodies in silk and jewels, or to ornament therewith God's house and God's ritual? Does any one doubt what all these excellent things are

* Pastoral Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, on the Present State of the Church, 1851. An emphatic stress is laid by the ritualists on this representative character of earthly worship; and it is evident that no arguments on the other side can be of the least avail, so long as the statements in the Bible on history, science or theology, are held to be absolutely true, and, further, while it is believed that, even if this were not the case, the decision of the Church has conclusively settled the matter.

meant for? or at least can he doubt what they are not meant for? not meant, surely, for sinners to make themselves fine withal. What presumption would that be, what senselessness! Does not the whole world speak in praise of God? Does not every star in the sky, every tree and flower upon earth, all that grows, all that endures, the leafy woods, the everlasting mountains, speak of God? Do not the pearls in the sea, and the jewels on the rocks, and the metals in the mine, and the marbles in the quarry,—do not all rich and beautiful substances everywhere witness of Him who made them? Are they not His work, His token, His glory? Are they not a portion of a vast natural temple, the heavens, earth and sea, a vast cathedral for the Bishop of our souls, the all-sufficient Priest, who first created all things and then again became by purchase their Possessor?.....Let the house of God be richly adorned, for it is His dwelling-place; priests, for they represent Him; kings, magistrates, judges, heads of families, for they are His ministers. These are called gods in Scripture, and 'all that is called god or that is worshipped' may receive of His gifts whose name they bear."*

For the Bishop of Exeter this poetry of worship had no very powerful charm; but perhaps on this account he was only laying more surely the foundations of the ritualistic system which is now gradually acquiring completeness. The clergy were charged with the preaching of the gospel, and that gospel was bound up with the administration of the Sacraments which rest on the Incarnation.

"As we are made by Baptism to be 'in Him,' to 'live in Him,' so in and by the other Sacrament, the Supper of the Lord, are given to us the means to sustain us in that blessed life,—the food and aliment of our new being;—for, 'the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ'—'the cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ'—of that body which is 'meat indeed,' of that blood which is 'drink indeed.' In a word, these two Sacraments are the means,—one, of our first union, the other, of our continuing in growth, 'in Him,' who is the 'one Mediator between God and Man,'—Himself both God and Man,—Perfect God and Perfect Man,—who made his *manhood* to be a quickening, life-giving principle to all 'his brethren,'—so He in love and mercy deigned to call us."†

But this imparting of the body and blood of Christ was

* Parochial Sermons, Vol. VI. Sermon. xxi. p. 337.

† Pastoral Letter, 1851, p. 71.

rendered possible only by the great sacrifice on Calvary. That sacrifice was distinctly a priestly act. It was the only real sacrifice which ever had been, or which ever can be, offered up to God. It was the act which renders the commemorative rites of Christian priests far more truly sacrifices than any which were offered under the Mosaic law. It was an act done by the only Being who ever was or can be a Priest by virtue of his own inherent power; and, lastly, it was an act which He performs again on every Christian altar by the hands of the priests whom He has allowed to bear that mysterious title upon earth.

It is impossible to exaggerate the influence of such convictions in bringing about the results which even High Churchmen whose courage is not superabundant are tempted to deplore. I have therefore no scruple in quoting language which I used on this subject in the diocese of Exeter fifteen years ago, because in no other way probably can we catch the full meaning of the ritualistic movement than by examining the doctrines put forth by the clergy in concurrence with the Bishop. The point chiefly to be noted is, that, while I expressed my own deepest conviction, I spoke only as others taught around me when I said,

“Christ alone is in real truth and in Himself a Priest by his own almighty power. Whatever priesthood was upon the earth, before He came down from heaven, and that which remains still, now that He has gone away again into heaven, owes all its virtue to His divine and changeless Priesthood. He, the Son of God, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, abideth a Priest continually; He alone has offered the only Sacrifice which ever possessed the least power and virtue in itself.

“And that one Priestly act did He perform on this earth, when He in His infinite mercy offered up the adorable Sacrifice of Himself. He, as Priest, did consecrate and sanctify Himself, and then offered up His own body as the Victim, and shed His blood, and by His mysterious working did impart them, even before he was nailed upon the Cross, to His apostles as he kept with them the last passover. Then began His awful agony. Then did He tread the winepress alone, and sprinkled His garments with blood, and did stain all His raiment; then He went forth travailing in the greatness of His strength, bearing upon Him the weight of a world's sin, and drew nigh unto the altar of Calvary. There did He, the great High Priest, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, present unto God as a living

Sacrifice Himself the Lamb without spot or blemish ; there did He, while all creation groaned and Nature shrouded itself under the horror of thick darkness, pay back to the Father the ransom for all the sons of Adam, there atone for all the inconceivable weight of sin which was brought in by Adam's fall.

"And this one Sacrifice being once offered up, there remained no more priestly work on earth for him to do. He had finished the work which his Father had given him, and now he must return to heaven, from henceforth expecting until His enemies be made his footstool. Moreover, He could not receive the gifts of the Spirit for man until he ascended up on high. And therefore he approached the gates of heaven, and the everlasting doors were lifted up at his coming, and the Angels rejoiced with exceeding great joy as He returned unto His glory, a Priest, a Conqueror, and a King.

"Then again he commenced his Priestly office, not, as once, to offer a new sacrifice for sin, but to present His one full oblation and satisfaction continually to the Father. Then in its perfect fulness began his mediation and intercession with God for men ; for before he took upon himself a human soul and body of the Virgin Mary, he was the mediator between God and man by virtue of his future sacrifice to be offered in due time. He could not plead for man, as being Himself perfect Man, until he had assumed the body which was prepared for him.

"But now being very Man as well as very God, he presents continually in heaven his one sacrifice on the Cross ; he ever presents it anew, in order that the power of it may be extended in undiminished fulness to all the members of his body. He offers no new Sacrifice, but continually presents the old ; or, rather, He, in an unchangeable Priesthood, offers up a Sacrifice ever new, never failing, placing continually this one atonement between us and God, pleading for us by the ceaseless merits of his one bitter Passion, being Himself at once Priest and Victim, Prophet and King ; as Man, offering prayer ; as God, hearing it ; as Mediator, interceding for sinners, as God, forgiving them ; as Priest, offering up the sacrifice, as God, accepting it ; as Man, uniting us to his human body and soul, as God, uniting us through his perfect Humanity to the infinite perfections of the Godhead.

"And again He only is a Priest by his own inherent power ; and by the virtue of this one Priesthood, they who are made priests on earth exercise their office. They to whom the Holy Ghost is given by the laying on of hands and who minister at the Altars of his Church on earth, do offer up to Him the great Christian Sacrifice, because He, the great High Priest, presents

unto God continually the same sacrifice in heaven. Therefore that which by his ever-living priesthood He does in heaven, is represented by His priests on earth. We plead before God, in the priesthood which Christ has himself bestowed upon us, the Sacrifice of his body and blood ; so that those things which we do, we do not of ourselves, but He performs them by our hands."

That such convictions should be barren of results was simply an impossibility. They who held them were content to work on in the midst of many difficulties and under the weight of much anxiety ; nor will their bitterest enemies deny that they were made to feel the weight of heavy blows and deep discouragements. They were conscious of fighting against unpopularity. They knew that the idea of a priestly order and a sacerdotal worship jarred strongly against the independent theories of Englishmen and the theological prepossessions of Puritans. Personally, therefore, they had for themselves no high aims, and anticipated no brilliant victories. The hour of triumph, they felt sure, would one day come ; but their wildest dreams never presented it as coming in their own lifetime. Seemliness, indeed, in the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice they were bound to secure ; but to this neither the law nor popular opinion offered much hindrance. It mattered little that the celebrated "Stone-altar Case" ruled that the communion-table should be of wood and moveable. This decision need not affect their doctrine, and their doctrine would assuredly sooner or later bear its fruit. Nay, for all results which were to be achieved by any other means than by the leaven of Catholic dogma and the operation of Catholic discipline, they felt something like contempt. At Cambridge and at Oxford, architectural societies had for some years been in existence ; and while by a diligent examination of sacred and domestic buildings they had amassed abundant and most valuable information relating to the ecclesiastical and civil architecture of our forefathers, effigies on tombs, monumental brasses, frescoes and painted windows furnished a wealth of materials for a Grammar and Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume. The pursuit had for some a sober, for others an exciting interest. In not a few a genuine love of historical study was blended with visions and fancies rising in mysterious crowds from the symbolical storehouse of Durandus. Not a single detail, they had

learnt, whether inside the church or without, was devoid of a mystical meaning.

"The triple breath of nave and aisles, the triple height of pier arch, triforium and clerestory, the triple length of choir, transepts and nave, set forth the Holy Trinity." Close to the entrance is the font, "for by regeneration we enter the Church ; it is deep and capacious, for we are buried in baptism with Christ ; it is of stone, for He is the Rock ; and its spiry cover teaches us, if we be indeed risen from its waters with Him, to seek those things that are above. Before us, in long-drawn vista, are the massy piers, which are the Apostles and Prophets ; they are each of many members, for many are the graces in every saint ; there is delicate foliage round the heads of all, for all were plentiful in good works..... We pass up the nave, that is through the Church Militant, till we reach the Rood Screen, the barrier between it and the Church Triumphant, and therein shadowing forth the death of the faithful. High above it hangs, on his triumphal cross, the image of Him who by his death hath overcome death ; on it are portrayed Saints and Martyrs, His warriors, who fighting under their Lord have entered into rest and inherit a tearless eternity..... The screen itself glows with gold and crimson,—with gold, for they have on their heads golden crowns,—with crimson, for they passed the Red Sea of martyrdom to obtain them. And through the delicate network and the unfolding holy doors we catch faint glimpses of the chancel beyond. There are the massy stalls, for in heaven is everlasting rest ; there are the Sedilia, emblems of the seats of the elders round the throne ; there is the Piscina, for they have washed their robes and made them white ; and there, heart and soul and life of all, the Altar, with its unquenched lights and golden carvings and mystic steps and sparkling jewels,—even Christ himself, by whose only merits we find admission to our heavenly inheritance. Verily, as we think on the oneness of its design, we may say, *Jerusalem ædificatur ut civitas cujus participatio ejus in idipsum.*"*

All this may be set down (and, doubtless, fairly set down) as an overstrained and heated mysticism ; but that such symbolism rests on Catholic dogma and may be made a powerful instrument in its propagation, it is mere folly to deny. But men who saw clearly that "the Church" had to fight a stern battle, looked with suspicion, if not with dislike, on the growth of a school which seemed likely to be

* Durandus on Symbolism, Book I. Translated by J. M. Neale, M.A., and Benjamin Webb, M.A. Introduction, cxxxii. (1843.)

carried away by an external æstheticism. The first and the greatest of all needs was that of discipline ; and to fasten the mind on grand architectural forms and gorgeous ecclesiastical decorations was to begin work at the wrong end. Hence, by the youthful enthusiasts of the Camden and the Oxford Architectural Societies, Mr. Newman was regarded as a harsh monitor whose yoke it was not always easy to bear. It was not altogether pleasant to be told that "to attempt Apostolical Christianity at all, we must attempt it all. It is a whole and cannot be divided ; and to attempt one aspect of it only is to attempt something else, which looks like it, instead of it. 'All is not gold that glitters,' as the proverb goes ; and all is not Catholic and Apostolic which affects what is high and beautiful and speaks to the imagination. Religion has two sides, a severe side and a beautiful ; and we shall be sure to swerve from the narrow way which leads to life, if we indulge ourselves in what is beautiful, while we put aside what is severe." Still less was it agreeable for the students of Durandus to be informed that while the congregation at Littlemore was perhaps preserved from the temptation of indulging in the "luxuries of religious worship," still there was "great cause to fear that others are not equally out of the danger." "Too many men at this time are for raising a high superstructure ere they have laid a deep foundation. They shrink from sowing in tears, though they would fain reap in joy.....They scoff at the ascetic life of the saints as an extravagance or corruption, or they slur over their austerities as if they were an accident of their religion, peculiar to *their* times, and they would live like the world, yet worship like the angels. These things being so, misgivings of mind arise of necessity at the present growing attention, which is seen on all sides of us, to church architecture and church decoration ; not as if all this were not right in itself, but lest we should be too fast about it ; lest it be disjoined in the case of the multitude from real seriousness, from deep repentance, from strict conscientiousness, from inward sanctity, from godly fear and awe." It was not altogether soothing to be told that it would be to their profit to recollect that "if it is our ambition to follow the Christians of the first ages as they followed the apostles and the apostles followed Christ, they had the discomfort of this world without its compensating gifts. No

high cathedrals, no decorated altars, no white-robed priests, no choirs for sacred psalmody,—nothing of the order, majesty and beauty of devotional services had they ; but they *had* trials, afflictions, solitariness, contempt, ill usage ; they were in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. If we have only the enjoyment and none of the pain, and they only the pain and none of the enjoyment, in what does our Christianity resemble theirs ? What are the tokens of identity between us ? Why do we not call theirs one religion, and ours another ? What points in common are there between the easy religion of this day, and the religion of St. Athanasius or St. Chrysostom ? How do the two agree except that the name of Christianity is given to both of them ?” *

The checks so given to æsthetical developments were from a Catholic point of view especially wholesome. There was something ridiculous and despicable in the idea of a ceremonial which meant nothing. If it was not an expression of Catholic dogma, the elaborate paraphernalia applied to the Eucharistic office became a hollow and dismal mockery. If the office itself was really in harmony with the creed and the practice of the Church Catholic in all ages, then the due celebration of it would fill them more and more with the spirit of godly union and concord, a spirit which would not assume the superiority of the Church of England over the Church of Rome, but which would weigh with unprejudiced impartiality what the latter had to say for herself. The time of trial soon came ; and the first band of converts, the most earnest, the most ingenuous, the most self-sacrificing, yielded to the conviction that, whatever in her practice might be distasteful to them, the Roman Church had at least more in common with the spirit of ancient Christendom than the Church of England, in spite of all its vaunted harmony with the faith of Jerome, Cyprian and Irenæus.

Thus far the whole question had turned on dogma, to the exclusion of ritualistic considerations. It was to be so no longer. The stream which had hitherto borne forward the High Churchmen in an undivided body was now to be

• Newman—*Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, XXV., p. 445.

parted into three branches. After many stumblings and after much speculation which to their adversaries might appear crude, querulous and sophistical, some were to be swallowed up by the ubiquitous Church of Rome, some others to retrace their steps and take their stand on a belief in the direct and immediate action of the Divine Spirit on the spirit of man, while the more part was to rest with something like dogged contentment in the Established Church, determined at all costs to maintain its Catholicity in spite of the Protestant sentiments of a vast proportion of its bishops, its clergy and its laity, in spite of the rapid spread of rationalistic views, and above all in defiance of heretical judgments from the supreme ecclesiastical tribunal of the land.

If I avow that I must have cast in my lot with the first section, had I not felt that by so doing I must for ever disclaim the right of pronouncing any proposition relating to faith or morality to be true or false on its own merits without reference to the decision of the Church, I do no violence to the axioms of Catholic unity, which for Dr. Newman and for those who followed him determined the balance in favour of the Church of Rome. I have before me some notes written about fourteen years ago, while the conflict was still going on in my mind, and in these the question is discussed with a very subordinate reference to matters of ritual. The doubt was not whether we might with a safe conscience remain in a communion whose offices were cold, unsatisfactory and repulsive, but whether (or not) "something more is necessary to give the Church of a particular country a claim to allegiance from the people, than the possession of the Succession, of Sacraments administered according to the right form of words, and of the three Creeds unmutilated. Are we to maintain that in addition to this the divine offices must be also free from heresy? We do maintain that ours are free; but what is to prevent people from maintaining the same thing when the Church itself is committed to heresy, since even now many hold that heretical statements are contained in the Prayer Book, and justify their position on that ground? How are we to be *sure* that the offices of the Church are wholly free from heresy, when a civil tribunal has already declared that the Baptismal office contains no clear expo-

sition of dogma? Of course, we do not believe the tribunal or allow its authority; but the question still remains, What *surety* are we to have that the Catholic faith is maintained whole and uncorrupt in the Church's offices? and who are to be the judges, or rather on what judgment are we to rely? If it be on that of the temporal sovereign with as many of the bishops (or as few) as he can get to co-operate with him (as in the case of Queen Elizabeth), what sort of safety have we, what right to live on with a contented and quiet conscience?" Such considerations must have proved irresistible, if the suspicion could have been wholly crushed, that the yoke so laid on the mind was altogether too heavy to be borne, too horrible to be a reality. The necessary conditions for salvation were, that a man should lead a holy life, professing the true faith, and be in communion with the Catholic Church. Failure in any one of these conditions vitiated all. It became necessary, therefore, to believe that a man of the holiest life, who wilfully refused to submit to the Church, would incur the Divine condemnation; and it became at the same time evident that the rejection of a proposition so horrifying to natural piety would leave the mind free to hold that justice, truth and mercy in God are in their nature and essence precisely the same as justice, truth and mercy in man,* and hence that every narrative which represents God as unjust or hard or revengeful must be utterly false and demoralizing. The travellers stood indeed at the parting of the roads, where the paths infinitely diverged; but whichever direction they might take, the disciples of Athanasius who submitted themselves to the Roman Church, and they who made up their minds to apply to theology the principles of inductive philosophy, ceased alike to influence the development of ritualism in the Church of England.

There remained then the third section, some of whom contented themselves with Dr. Pusey's curiously twisted chain of assumptions, and who with him maintained that whatever was the truth had been revealed to the apostles from the first; that nothing which had not been *de fide* from the beginning could ever be made part of the faith, and that on both these grounds the theory of developments

* J. S. Mill—*Examination of Sir Wm. Hamilton's Philosophy*, p. 101, &c.
VOL. III. R

was untenable; that the Church of Rome by adopting this theory had departed from the Catholic faith, and that the position of the Church of England was in all respects defensible and valid. Others again there were in the body of Anglican High Churchmen who had not grown up under the influence of men like Mr. Newman and Archdeacons Wilberforce and Manning,—men who were quite satisfied with “Notes of the Church” which Dr. Newman had found unsatisfactory or delusive,—men whose minds were amply set at rest by the apparent activity of religious life in the English Church, and who felt that nothing was needed but a more efficient and imposing ecclesiastical machinery. It became certain, therefore, that if the high Sacramental doctrine maintained by Dr. Newman, and still more perhaps by Archdeacon Wilberforce,* were still upheld, the result must be a rapid development of ritualism. And unquestionably the doctrines propounded were, if possible, even higher and less compromising than before. It was necessary to insist on every dogma of the sacerdotal system with unmistakable clearness, in order to counteract the iniquitous decisions of courts which legalized heresy. The Bishop of Exeter, while maintaining that the Gorham judgment had not committed the whole Church of England to a denial of baptismal regeneration, because it asserted that sufficient reason had not been shewn for keeping Mr. Gorham out of his benefice, yet held the crisis to be so grave that a more constant and earnest maintenance of this dogma had become imperatively necessary. The condemnation of which Archdeacon Denison escaped the consequences only by a technical flaw, bound the clergy to be constant in season and out of season in upholding the true doctrine of the Eucharist.

With such principles as these, the Common Prayer of Matins and Evensong fell inevitably into the background in comparison with the Eucharistic celebration. It was felt more and more that the Great Sacrifice was the thing to be done, while the other offices were not to be left undone. Nothing can shew more clearly the absurdity of supposing that the sacerdotalists had any abstract love for decking themselves out in fine habiliments, than the simplicity with which they have conducted the ordinary services of the

* The Doctrine of the Incarnation. 1849.

Established Church. If they had felt that satisfaction in wearing gay clothes which the "Spectator" attributes to them, there was quite as good a field in the Order of Morning and Evening Prayer as there is at the communion-table or altar for displaying vestments, which "A. L. B. fears he cannot place at a lower figure than from £12 to £18 each." Far, however, from hearing any charges of the introduction of new-fangled or ancient vestments into the ordinary services, we are more likely to be told that the ritualists slur them over with comparative neglect, hurrying through Psalms, Canticles and Versicles, the staple of the fine "Cathedral Service" which the Bishop of London so disinterestedly wishes to see extended to our parish churches. Doubtless it would be a pleasant way of solving a serious difficulty, if the sacerdotalists would content themselves and their congregations with exquisite music, and perhaps even with the gay robes on which the "Spectator" and "Times" expend their lofty scorn, in the performance of the offices in the "Book of Common Prayer." Probably Lord Ebury himself would feel his indignation cooling down, if he had evidence that they cared only for good music and expensive clothes. He would have little objection to a Litany beautified with an "Agnus Dei" or a "Dona Nobis" from the masses of Mozart, or to a band of coped or chasubled clergy chanting the "Te Deum" to the most majestic of Gregorian tones, if he felt sure that they meant only what he means when he recites the "Te Deum" or repeats the responses of the Litany. But these men do not care for these things; and if Lord Ebury and the Bishop of London were to go frequently to their churches, they would soon learn that they do not care for them. There is absolutely no reason for doubting the protestations of Mr. Stewart, of St. Mary Magdalene's, Munster Square, or of Mr. Mackonochie, of St. Alban's, Holborn, that the idea of mere form and ceremonial as such is to them simply nauseous, that they loathe it as a dismal and intolerable mockery. With their Catholic convictions, they are thankful to have the ritual; but they can quite well afford, if need be, to go without it. Acts of Parliament may strip them of their vestments, may put out their lights, may rob the altars of their brodered frontals, may remove the image of the Redeemer from cross, window and picture; but no Act of Parliament can compel

them to part with their belief, or make them slovenly and irreverent in the celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Let the Bishop of London examine carefully the "Devotions for Holy Communion," translated many years ago by Dr. Pusey from Horst's "*Paradisus Animæ Christianæ*," and then ask himself whether any other result than that which has taken place could possibly be looked for. Throughout the book there is not a single word which implies the slightest pomp, not a hint that copes or chasubles and jewelled altars, not even that hoods and stoles are necessary; but the seed must bear its fruit, when before the celebration the priest is taught to say,

"Because in this Sacrifice we *handle* the very Fountain of all Grace, the Author of all our Salvation, I offer unto Thee this Sacrifice of Thy Son, that, asking through His Blood and in His Name, we may obtain that which of our own desert we could not."*

And again :

"Behold, I lay before the Altar of Thy Majesty that living Oblation which Thou in great compassion didst send to be immolated on the Altar of the Cross for us."†

It is a mere waste of time to quarrel about words. It matters nothing whether the Articles of the Church of England condemn some doctrine or other which is called Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation or by any other name; but there is not the slightest doubt that the man who can honestly and believingly recite the beautiful Rhythm of Thomas Aquinas, "*Adoro te devote, latens Deitas*," translated in the same volume, and inserted also in the Hymnal used at St. Alban's, Holborn, is in absolute harmony with Tridentine teaching, and with the faith of Bede, Anselm and Lanfranc, as of Bellarmine, Torquemada and Bossuet. It is useless to haggle about terms, if a man utters his sincere conviction in the words,

"Lo, to Thee surrendered, my whole heart is bowed,
Tranced as it beholds Thee, shrined within the cloud.
Sight, and touch, and taste, are all in Thee *deceived*,
'Tis the hearing only safely is believed."

Let Dr. Tait take further the "Divine Liturgy," a Manual for the Altar Office, edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley, and

* P. 92.

† P. 95.

he will see that all efforts directed against the splendour of Eucharistic ceremonial are a vain beating of the air. The ritual lives on the doctrine; the dogma is not slain, it is not even weakened, by maiming and mutilating the ritual, unless the dogmatic formulæ are also changed or taken away. It is impossible, by waging war on outward rites alone, to destroy the inward faith which believes in the actual, palpable presence, on the altar, of the Body which was once slain on Calvary. For there is nothing which the sacerdotalists are more eager to avow than the fact that their dogma of the Real Presence is not to be identified with the proposition that God is really and truly present at all times and in all places. Such a confusion of ideas deprives the Eucharistic dogma of all meaning whatsoever. Christ is present, indeed, on the altar, because He is God as well as Man; but the union of his humanity with the Godhead justifies the Catholic Christian in invoking the aid of every portion of his glorified Body, and in addressing to his Person devotions which can only be described as erotic. There is no attempt at disguise in the matter; and it must be remembered that many of the notions embodied in prose for private devotion are found also in hymns which are publicly sung in the churches; and assuredly we have not yet reaped the crop which is springing up with goodly growth from the seed of these devotional songs. Plainly, then, the dogma set forth in the Eucharist justifies the worshiper in praying:

“Passion of Christ, strengthen me;
Bloody sweat of the person of Christ, heal me;
O good Jesus, hearken unto me;
Within thy sacred wounds hide me.”*

“O sweetest Blood, that can implore .
Pardon of God, and heaven restore,
The heaven which sin had lost;
While Abel's blood for vengeance pleads,
What Jesus shed still intercedes
For those who wrong him most.”†

That the Eucharistic presence is different in kind from the omnipresence of the Eternal Father, is placed beyond all question by such meditations as the following:

“A Heart which loved humility less than did the Sacred Heart

* Divine Liturgy, p. 14.

† Ibid., p. 18.

of Jesus might have thought that for the greater glory of God and the greater benefit of souls it would have been better to have had some measure to his humiliation in this Divine Sacrament, and to have allowed some visible sign of it to be perceived by man. And this would seem to be the more true, if we reflect that He would have been more easily known and revered in the Holy Eucharist, if He had been pleased to allow some visible token of His hidden majesty to have appeared. What heart then could have resisted a glimpse, although but a passing one, of the Divine goodness of His adorable Humanity? But the Sacred Heart of Jesus thought not so; for in His infinite wisdom He deemed that His greater glory and our greater good would be increased by His giving us in the Blessed Sacrament the highest example of His profound Humility.”*

“It is of faith that we believe Him whom we adore, present on our Altars, to be the Divine Redeemer, as He now reigns on the right hand of Almighty God in the highest heaven. But why then does He conceal His Majesty under these veils? Why does He appear to neglect in this blessed Sacrament what is becoming to His own dignity, thus exposing Himself to much profanation and irreverence? Oh, is it not because the difficulties which arise from the great difference between His Majesty and our unworthiness could only be overcome by the infinite Love of His most loving Heart?”†

To say that if a glimpse of His Majesty in the Eucharist would convert every soul, His Love ought to induce Him continually to vouchsafe such irresistible glimpses, would of course be scouted as the suggestion of a carnal mind. We may pass on, then, to note that the offering is an actual sacrifice.

“We offer unto thy most excellent Majesty thy gifts bestowed upon us, a pure Victim, a holy Victim, an unspotted Victim, the Holy Bread of Eternal Life, and the Chalice of Everlasting Salvation.”

And further:

“We most humbly beseech thee, Almighty God, command that these oblations be borne by the hands of thy holy angel, to thy Altar on high, in the sight of thy Divine Majesty.”‡

“Praised for ever be the blessed Sacrament,” is the burden of several Litanies to be used after the consecration of the elements. For distinctions drawn between the human nature

* Divine Liturgy, p. 30.

† Ibid., p. 34.

‡ Ibid., p. 126.

of Christ and the component parts of his body, Catholic belief cares nothing.

“O Holy Flesh of Jesus Christ
Upon the Altar lying,
Last gift of the Incarnate Word
Before His precious dying,
O living Bread of Angels bright,
Who wrought'st Redemption's story,
O hope of each one named from Thee,
We give Thee thanks and glory.”*

This is the true faith, and only in the spirit of this faith can the Sacrament be worthily received.

“He gave unto the twelve
That which should feel the Cross ;
They ate and drank the Giver,—He
Nor suffered change nor loss.
And ever since that day
(Who may the wonder tell ?)
The faithful eat of Christ, yet He
Abides unchangeable.
Whoever eats and drinks
Aright, shall perish never ;
Whoever eats and drinks amiss,
Shall dwell in death for ever.”†

If still some faint doubts remain, a clause in the Litany addressed to Jesus, “who becomes our daily food in this life, to prepare us to feed on Him eternally in the next,” will avail, if sincerely uttered, to remove them.

“From presuming to fathom the depth of Divine omnipotency by the short line of human reason, Good Lord, deliver us.”‡

And therefore without misgiving they may say,

“O Holy Jesus, we believe
That Thou art present here ;
With heart and soul we surely know
Our dearest Lord is near.
For though Thy Blessed Presence
Is not visibly revealed,
Faith tells us in these sacred forms
Thou art indeed concealed ;

* *Divine Liturgy*, p. 138.

† *Ibid.*, p. 192.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 241.

On bended knee then let us pray
That Thou mayest be adored,
For aye in Thy dread Eucharist,
O Thou most gracious Lord."*

Or again,

"Holy Flesh of Christ our King,
Thee adorable we sing ;
In the new Law's happy vale,
Pasture of the new flock, Hail."†

And again,

"Blood of Jesus, stream of life,
Sacred stream with blessings rife,
From Thy broken Body shed
On the Cross, that Altar dread,
Given to be our drink divine,
Fill my heart and make it Thine ;
Blood of Christ, my succour be,
Miserere, Domine."‡

With such convictions as these it is natural that the aspirations of the ecstatic soul should find utterance in the peculiar style of the Song of Songs.

"How beautiful art Thou, my Beloved, O Christ Jesu, the Beloved of my prayers! How lovely art Thou, how good and loving, O my sole delight, O my life, O my joy!"§

"O my Beloved, the chiefest among ten thousand, in whom my soul is well pleased to dwell all the days of my life ; O my peace-maker, in whom is highest peace and true rest.....O Lord Jesu, how great is the sweetness of Thy Feast! O how sweet would it be for me in Thy presence out of my inmost affection to shed tears, and with the Blessed Magdalene to wash Thy feet with my tears! Verily, in the presence of Thee and Thy holy Angels, my whole heart should burn and weep for joy. O what a mighty Lord have I received! How pleasant a companion have I obtained ; how loved a guest have I brought in ; how faithful a friend have I accepted ; how beautiful and noble a bridegroom have I espoused !"||

"O most sweet Lord Jesu Christ, transfix the affections of my inmost soul with that most joyous and healthful wound of Thy love, with true, serene, most holy apostolic charity, that my soul may ever languish and melt with entire love and longing for Thee.....And be Thou ever my Hope and my whole Confidence,

* Divine Liturgy, p. 269.

† Ibid., p. 271.

‡ Ibid., p. 289.

§ Ibid., p. 220.

|| Ibid., p. 221.

my Riches, my Delight, my Pleasure and my Joy, my Rest and Tranquillity, my Peace, my Sweetness and my sweet Savour, my Food and Refreshment, my Refuge and Help, my Wisdom, my Portion, my Possession and my Treasure.....Let Thy wounds be to me Meat and Drink, whereby I may be fed, inebriated and delighted.”*

“One holds me fast. Taken in his pure embrace,
I rest in peace.
Flows on my weary heart his softening grace,
And troubles cease.
Though cold the storm, and fierce the blasting wind,
I do not fear ;
For in His Breast a covert safe I find,
No storm comes there.
He shields me tenderly, my Spouse, my Love,
He guides me on
To mansions fair, prepared for me above,
Where He has gone.”†

A creed like this must be accompanied by a scrupulous and even feverish anxiety to avoid the slightest semblance of profanity and irreverence. Nothing common or unclean must approach the spot on which is offered the Holy Flesh of the King of kings. Not a grain of the bread, not a drop of the wine, must be suffered to fall on the ground, or to be trodden under foot of men. It is right indeed to offer incense in obedience to the express commands of God ‡ but more imperative is the duty of complying with all the “Cautels” laid down for the due celebration of “Mass.” These cautels are curiously minute.

“The priest must not think, but know for certain that he has the appointed matter ; this is, wheaten bread and wine (mixed) with a modicum of water. Of the wine and water he will be able to be certified after this fashion. Let him test it by his minister, who will taste both the wine and the water ; but the priest himself ought not to taste it. Let him pour a drop upon his hand, rub it with his finger, and smell it ; so that he may be the more certified. He must trust neither the mark upon the cruet nor the colour of it, since both often deceive. He must see that the chalice be not broken ; he must look to the wine. If it is corrupted, he must in no wise celebrate ; if it is not sour, he must

* Divine Liturgy, p. 229.

† Ibid., p. 275.

‡ Directorium Anglicanum, p. 12.

in no wise pass it by. If it is too watery, he must not use it, unless he knows that the wine exceeds the water; and in every case where there is a doubt either in regard to the sourness or the mixture or the excessive thickness of the wine, whether it can be used, we counsel the priest not to use it; because in this Sacrament nothing must be done concerning which there is any doubt, where most explicitly it is to be said, 'Hoc est enim corpus meum,' 'Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei.' Let him also see that he offer the oblations conveniently, and that he pour out the wine discreetly, because this Sacrament ought to be appreciable by the senses, to be seen, touched and tasted, in order that the sense may be refreshed by the *species*, and the intellect be nourished *ex re contenta*."*

Again, before Mass the Priest is to be careful that he

"— do not wash his mouth or teeth, but only his lips from without with his mouth closed as he has need, lest perchance he should intermingle the taste of water with his saliva. After Mass also, he should beware of expectorations as much as possible, until he shall have eaten and drunken, lest by chance anything should have remained between his teeth or in his *fauces*, which by expectorating he might eject."†

In his private devotions during celebration,

"— in saying the Collects the priest should observe always to say an unequal number. One collect on account of the Unity of the Godhead. Three on account of the Trinity of Persons. Five on account of the five-fold passion of Christ. Seven on account of the seven-fold grace of the Holy Ghost. It is not lawful to exceed the number seven."

If the priest "faints in the Canon, some actions having been already performed, yet before the transubstantiation and consecration of the Sacrament, then another priest ought to re-commence from the place where he left off, and to supply just so much as is omitted."

Once more :

"If the consecrated Host, on account of cold, or any other cause, slips from the priest's hands into the Chalice, whether before or after the dividing of it, he ought not to take it out of the Blood, nor to reiterate anything by reason of this, or to change aught concerning the celebration of the Sacrament; but he must proceed in making the sign of the Cross and in other matters as if he held It in his hand."

* *Directorium Anglicanum*, p. 85.

† *Ibid.*, p. 86.

“If the Eucharist hath fallen to the ground, the place where it lay must be scraped and fire kindled thereon, and the ashes reserved beside the altar.

“Also, if by negligence any of the Blood be spilled upon a table fixed to the floor, the priest must take up the drop with his tongue, and the plane of the table must be scraped, and the shavings burnt with fire, and the ashes reserved with the relics beside the altar.

“Also, if any one by any accident of the throat vomit up the Eucharist, the vomit ought to be burned, and the ashes ought to be reserved near the altar.”*

Of the complete Judaism (or Paganism) of all this it is useless to speak. On men who love to walk in chains and profess to move with greater ease under iron collars, any hint of the advantages of freedom must be thrown away. But tedious and revolting though the task may be, yet the examination now gone through brings us many steps nearer to the end of the inquiry. It shews us at the least two things: (1) that all this dogma and all these devotions cannot spring up on soil which is wholly unfitted to receive them; and (2) that all attempts to cut down symbolical ritual must be unavailing, so long as the dogmas of which that ritual is the expression are maintained by members of the Established Church. In other words, the legal argument, as directed against rites and ceremonies alone, can be of no avail. There can be no question that the “Book of the Administration of the Sacraments in the Church of England” (which is quite distinct from the “Book of Common Prayer”) has many expressions which are fully in harmony with, if they do not actually bear out, the Eucharistic theory of the “Directorium Anglicanum” and the “Divine Liturgy.” It is well enough to point to the fact that the body and blood are said to be received spiritually, and that “no adoration is intended or ought to be done either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received or unto any corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood,”—partly because neither of these propositions is denied by the most ultra sacerdotalists, and because, even if they could not be admitted by them, it would only prove (as they might urge) that sentiments of another kind have been interpolated into the Catholic language of the English Mass.

* *Directorium Anglicanum*, p. 91.

Not even Dr. Lee, or Mr. Orby Shipley, or Dr. Newman, or the Archbishop of Westminster, have asserted that any adoration ought to be done, or is done, to the sacramental bread or wine, or to any corporal presence of Christ's natural body and blood. The body wherewith He ascended to heaven is, they would say, a spiritual and glorified body, and the adoration is paid to this spiritual body, really present on the altar; and thus the assertion that it is against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one is an impotent compromise which might satisfy a Ridley or a Latimer, but would fail to exclude a Bellarmine or De Maistre. It might undoubtedly be urged with truth that the high Eucharistic doctrine was not maintained by many who had a hand in bringing the Church of England into its present shape, and that the language of other parts of the Communion office likewise breathes a very different spirit. But to this it may be replied, that the Church of England nowhere calls herself Protestant, and that all such language cannot possibly prove more than the fact that Protestants have a legal standing-ground within her pale. This legal position, however, it is urged, is secured only by virtue of the temporary subjection of the Church to the State; and if the Puritan may lawfully take his stand on seemingly Lutheran or Calvinistic expressions, much more may the Catholic take his stand on the substantial agreement of the Order and Canon of the English Mass with the Liturgies of the Catholic Church in all ages and in all lands. If I am not mistaken, this is a position which cannot easily be impugned. For the Protestant character which, it is said, the Church of England assumed at the Reformation, these men care nothing; or rather they deny the fact. They could not with any honesty say that in their theology generally they agreed with Cranmer or Bucer or Whitgift or Parker; they could not with any fairness deny that they are doing their utmost to purge the Church of England of the unholy leaven introduced into it by Edward VI. and his knavish counsellors. Far from disavowing this scheme, they glory in it, asserting that the Church of England is really Catholic, both in theory and in practice, and substantially also in law. They ask only for fair play, and fear no appeal to the statute-book.

"Our appeal," says Mr. Stuart, "is to the heart and conscience

of the nation at large; and to what else can the Bishop of London himself appeal? These public attempts to put down Catholic faith and worship in the Church of England do a deal of good. They force upon an ignorant and prejudiced people some little knowledge of the truth of Catholic principles; and this is just the very thing we most want. The Gorham trial taught England the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration; Dr. Pusey's suspension and the Denison, Cheyne, and Brechin trials taught the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Poole persecution taught the doctrine of Confession; and the St. Barnabas and St. George-in-the-East riots taught the measure and lawfulness of Catholic worship. And just so, depend upon it, any future *raid* upon the Church will be overruled to the same good ends, if only we ourselves act sincerely and conscientiously in what we do.

"If the Bishop of London is inclined to run a muck at Catholic Faith and Catholic Worship, by all means let him do so. He has as good a right to his opinion as we have to ours. If he wishes to Puritanize the Church, as I believe he does, let him take all lawful means towards his object; and if we wish to Catholicise the Church, as we avowedly do, let us take all lawful means towards our object too: and God defend the right.

"Who is this awful despot, this terrible Turk, this Pope *in posse*, who is ready to cut off all our heads in five minutes, if we provoke him? He is a constitutional officer of the Church, and himself subject to its laws as much as any one else."*

In truth, we are paying the penalty (if penalty it is to be termed) of basing a religious society on the principle of Comprehension. Of the whole mass of propositions which make up the Thirty-nine Articles, it has been well said that no man could possibly assert his agreement with all. If he is a Calvinist, he agrees of course with the Seventeenth and some other Articles; but he can have no liking for those which in tone are clearly Arminian, nor can the Arminian relish those which cause a hearty satisfaction to the Calvinist. There may, of course, be some who regard all with equal indifference; but it is somewhat unfair to say that the benefits of a system which has shielded Messrs. Gorham, Williams and Wilson, shall not be extended to those who put a very different interpretation on its formularies. Already there are not wanting signs that we may in this controversy

* Director. Angl. xxxii., quoted from the "Guardian" newspaper for August 2, 1865.

be betrayed into a grave injustice. The "Spectator," in an article already cited, speaks with indignant reprobation of the practice of Exorcism as set forth in the Exeter Pontifical. Certainly it is not pleasant to be told that

"The priest is to say, 'I exorcise thee, creature of salt, by the living God (here the sign of the Cross), by the true God (another sign), by the Holy God (a third sign), by the God who by the prophet Eliseus commanded thee to be cast into the water,' &c. Then a blessing is prayed for upon this 'creature of salt:' then the 'creature of water' is exorcised, and then a blessing prayed on the 'creature of water;' and then the consecrator casts the salt into the water, and a blessing is prayed on this 'creature of salt and water, that wherever it shall be sprinkled, by the invocation of thy Holy Name, all malice of the unclean spirit may be driven away, and the trace of the venomous serpent chased far hence.' So, too, on Palm Sunday, a priest, 'vested in a red silk cope, and standing on the third step of the altar,' is to 'exorcise thee, creature of flowers and branches,' that 'thou whole army of Satan, thou whole inroad of evil spirits be rooted up and pulled out from these creatures of flowers and branches.'"

Why this should be more ridiculous than Mr. Maurice's notion of a devil which is not God, which is not to be found in ourselves, and which is not to be identified with nature, it may perhaps be not easy to determine; but it is plain enough that, if we wish to be just, even these superstitions, miserable though they may be, must not be put down by the strong hand of the law. To say, as the "Spectator" does, that "the English Church in denying transubstantiation throws away the key to all this sort of ceremonial, and leaves it an unmeaning pageant where it is adopted at all," is simply disingenuous. The Twenty-eighth Article may condemn some theory of a change in the substance of the bread and wine; but whether this is a fair definition of the Roman or Tridentine or Catholic doctrine, is another question. The Anglican Communion office, however, amply justifies the belief of Cosin and Andrewes, Laud and Montagu; and their belief requires for its full expression an elaborate Eucharistic ritual. With a rashness still more astonishing, the "Spectator" asserts that the exorcism of salt and water should be suppressed by law as entirely counter to the "true faith of any part of the English Church." To speak thus is to beg the question, and to determine at

the same time what the true faith of the Church of England is. Under the present constitution, such a definition cannot be laid down. They who hate exorcisms and transubstantiation will doubtless be justified by the Court of Arches; and those who love them will perhaps come not much worse off.

But, in truth, when we are treating a disease of the mind and spirit—a disease which must continue to spread so long as the mental food which suits it is administered—we may be pardoned for thinking that a resort to the strict letter of the bond is scarcely right or politic. The "Contemporary Review" began its first number in January last with an elaborate argument on "Ritualism and the Ecclesiastical Law," in which the writer proved, very much to his own satisfaction, and probably to that of many "safegoing" men, that stone altars fastened to a wall are decidedly illegal; that the cross is sanctioned only as an ornament or decoration of a church, and not when it is placed on the Communion-table; that Credence-tables, although sanctioned, are not to be considered as capable of a use or meaning connected with any superstitious usage of the Church of Rome; and that in the case of *Westerton v. Liddell*, although the candlesticks at St. Barnabas were permitted to *remain*, no decision was given *in favour* of altar-lights. Hence, in his opinion, the matter resolves itself "into the simple question, Does the first Prayer Book of Edward say anything about Altar-lights? It is not even pretended that this is the case; and hence by a necessary inference from the judgment they seem to be quite unauthorized."* From this position it would follow that organs and surpliced choirs are unauthorized also. Does Mr. Shaw suppose that such a plea as this will induce the disciples of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Orby Shipley to modify their opinions? Does he think that a few legal decisions, allowing one ornament the more, or leaving a robe the less, will have any effect on convictions which are ultimately justified by the teaching of the Bishop of Ely and Dr. Wordsworth, not less than by that of Mr. Molyneux and Mr. Stewart? The legal remedy, if ever it could have been effectual, is now twenty years too late. "The real importance of ritual," says Mr. Molyneux,†

* P. 15.

† "Guardian," Feb. 28, 1866.

"arises from its connection with doctrine." The remark is significant chiefly as coming from one who has had to fight a battle with Dr. Harold Browne on the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; and the truth of the assertion could at once be tested, if the Bishop of London would offer to his clergy the liberty of using copes, chasubles, dalmatics, lighted candles and incense, during the times of Morning and Evening Prayer, on condition that none of these things should be used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. An indignant refusal would shew how far the "Times" is right in ascribing to Mr. Stewart and Mr. Upton Richards an extravagant passion for ecclesiastical millinery. It may possibly be necessary to remind the anti-ritualists that there are two sides to the law, and that it may be worth their while to heed the threats which have been already thrown out, that, if they persecute clergymen who exceed the law, ritualists will in their turn prosecute clergymen who fall short of the law; and the law, it must be remarked, is at the least as clear in insisting on daily prayer in the churches as in forbidding the use of candles and incense.

In truth, any appeal to the existing law or for a Parliamentary revision is, as Mr. Keble has forcibly remarked, "perfectly suicidal" in all who do not wish to have the bounds of that freedom extended, which was secured by the decisions in the cases of Mr. Gorham, the Essayists, and the Bishop of Natal. Mr. Keble is well aware that "the rising liberalism of the day, being not so much irreligious as anti-dogmatic, while it professes to look with impartial indifference on our several schools and sections, yet has no objection to play them one against another for the purpose of putting down all distinct and exclusive teaching. Why do its professors laugh to scorn all that we say, do, or feel as Englishmen, not merely as Churchmen, touching the abuse of the Royal Supremacy in the matter of the Judicial Committee? Because they know well, that, as things are, the Royal Supremacy is ultimately the mind and will of the House of Commons; and that mind and will being on the whole averse to dogma, they, of course, uphold the institution which is found to work in the same direction."* Mr. Keble is content to retain the belief that "after the Restora-

* "Guardian," Jan. 24, 1866.

tion, while the Church retained the rubrics in question and added here and there other enactments of the same sort, she revived also from King Edward's second book the admonition which now stands at the end of her Communion office, thus unequivocally, and once for all, rejecting all carnal glosses, whether brought from Italy or Germany, while she accepted in the highest possible sense the old liturgical tenet of the Real Presence.*

Equally beside the mark are the learned, though singularly wearisome, discussions with which Mr. W. B. Marriott has loaded the columns of the "Guardian" on the origin of the chasuble, dalmatic and other ecclesiastical vestments. Even the Dean of Westminster has condescended to extract a jest from the argument that the dalmatic and chasuble are forms of a great coat introduced by two not very respectable Roman emperors called Commodus and Elagabalus; and Mr. Marriott has more seriously denounced the absurdity of laying a stress on garments which were at first only the ordinary garb of Roman citizens. The archæological discussion may be extended indefinitely; in Mr. Marriott's hands it has already grown into a volume; but Mr. Skinner, in a letter to the "Guardian" (Jan. 17, 1866), has settled the matter for all impartial judges by asserting that "the only question of practical interest *now* concerning vestments is not what theorists, like your ingenious correspondent, may wish to have been, or to become, the rule, but what the whole Church of Christ throughout the world has *actually* ruled."

Whether a high sacerdotalism, like that of Dr. Pusey and Archdeacon Denison, is a wholesome element in a State Church, is a question not very easily answered. That faith must be very elastic or very far-seeing which after recent decisions can see in the Church of England a society which in no essential point has departed from the creed of the Church Catholic. The number, both of the clergy and laity, is steadily and rapidly increasing who hold that no statement whatsoever is to be received, simply as resting on the authority of a book or of a church,—who hold that a vast amount of mythology is mixed up with the creed of Christians generally, and that every part of the Bible must be submitted

* "Guardian," Jan. 24, 1866.

to the same rigid criticism which we apply to the text of Thucydides, Dionysius or Livy. To such the revival of ritualism, as the expression of a high sacerdotal theory, looks like the last phase in the conflict which is to end by freeing the Established Church from all deductive theology. In the eyes of Dr. Newman and Archbishop Manning it looks like the last vain struggle of men of genuine Catholic aspirations against a State Church which, like some great monster, shakes off from time to time incumbrances that turn out to be annoying, and then goes on its way or sinks into slumber as unconcerned as before. In Canon Oakeley's judgment there is something like a disingenuous by-play, both on the part of the ritualists and on that of the Bishops to whose authority they profess to be subject.

"The start which has been made during the last few years in the direction of ceremonial religion, apart from any corresponding advances in sensitiveness to the necessity of an ordained provision for dogmatic teaching, appears to me not only not a gain but a distinct and conspicuous evil. It can have no other effect than to amuse with mere baubles a number of good men who mistake the form for the substance. The rites and ceremonies of religion are not only most beautiful in themselves, but re-act powerfully upon its truths, when they are natural expressions of those truths and are so understood by all who witness them; but they can no more teach religion of themselves, or be a substitute for it, than the emblazoned pall which covers the corpse of a monarch can sustain the idea of a living royalty. I do not indeed deny that these mimics of Catholic ceremonial may do us a service in familiarizing the minds of Englishmen with a type of worship which had been totally obliterated; but this is a very different thing from saying that they represent a reality where they are, or can be otherwise than most injurious to those who delight in them, by leading them to confound the outward show with the true spirit of Catholicity. But even this is scarcely their worst result. They cannot be practised without entailing a system of equivocation and compromise highly prejudicial to the moral sense. The only legitimate interpreter of doubtful rubrics is the Ordinary; and it certainly cannot be said either that the rubrics on which these practices are founded are clearly in their favour, or that an explanation of their ambiguities is usually sought from the living authority. Hence a considerable body of the clergy are constantly seeking to hoodwink their bishops, who

are themselves not very impatient of the process : and thus the Catholic principles of authority and obedience find their counterpart in a mutual relation of connivance and evasion."*

Canon Oakeley is perhaps a little hard on men who doubtless will be glad hereafter to follow him to their true home. The signs of an end, possibly not very far off, are coming into sight. In his great battle with the Arians, Athanasius succeeded in obtaining the decision that Christ, the Logos, is co-eternal and co-equal with God the Father. The relations of this doctrine with other doctrines were not comprehended by him in their fulness ; perhaps it was impossible that they should be. But this conqueror over sin and death is present mysteriously, yet really, on every Christian altar when, by the hands of the priest, He himself presents anew to the Father the sacrifice of blood offered up once for all on Calvary ; and, further, He who is very God as well as very Man, begotten from everlasting of the Father, and by whom all things were made, is also the Son of Mary. Further still, He is her Son, not as by the choice of a passive instrument, but by virtue of her co-operating will. Such is the outline of the great argument urged by Dr. Newman in favour of the cultus of Mary in his recently published "Remarks on Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon ;" and to the sacerdotal party in the Church of England it must in the end prove irresistible. It is impossible to deny that duties, not originally defined, may arise out of relations which shall at a later stage have been clearly ascertained. In this way only could Bishop Butler justify the worship paid to the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity. "Does not," he asks, "the duty of religious regards to both these Divine Persons, as immediately arise, to the view of reason, out of the very nature of these offices and relations, as the inward goodwill and kind intention, which we owe to our fellow-creatures, arises out of the common relations between us and them ?"† His conclusion is, that "the internal worship to the Son and the Holy Ghost is no further matter of pure revealed command, than as the relations they stand in to us are matters of pure revelation ; for the relations being known, the obliga-

* Letter to Archbishop Manning on the Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work, p. 10.

† Analogy, Part II. ch. i.

tions to such internal worship are obligations of reason, arising out of those relations themselves." Dr. Newman is addressing himself not to Anglican Liberals or Anglican Puritans, but to those who call themselves Catholics; and these indubitably admit his position that Justin, Irenæus, and other Fathers, speak of the Virgin Mary not merely "as the physical instrument of our Lord's taking flesh, but as an intelligent responsible cause of it, her faith and obedience being accessories to the Incarnation, and gaining it as her reward."* To Dr. Pusey he can further say, without fear of contradiction, "It is an integral portion of the Faith fixed by Ecumenical Council, a portion of it which you hold as well as I, that the Blessed Virgin is Theotocos, Deipara, or Mother of God; and this word, when thus used, carries with it no admixture of rhetoric, no taint of extravagant affection,—it has nothing else but a well-weighed, grave, dogmatic sense, which corresponds and is adequate to the sound. It intends to express that God is her Son, as truly as any one of us is the son of his own mother."† It is hard indeed to see how they who admit the fact can resist the conclusion. "If this be so, what can be said of any creature whatever, which may not be said of her? What can be said too much, so that it does not compromise the attributes of the Creator? He indeed might have created a being more perfect, more admirable, than she is. He might have endowed that being, so created, with a richer grant of grace, of power, of blessedness; but in one respect she surpasses all even possible creations, viz., that she is Mother of her Creator." With the argument itself we are not here concerned. The point which connects it with the subject of ritualism is this, that its complete validity is already admitted by the sacerdotalists of the Established Church and is diligently impressed upon the people. For convincing proof of this assertion we need go only to the Hymnal Noted, as in use at St. Alban's, Holborn.

"Most glorious of the Virgin choirs,
 Sublime above the starry sky,
 Who with pure milk from thine own breast
 Thy great Creator didst supply."‡

Dr. Newman may well say that this fact is the source of

* Remarks, p. 38.

† Ibid., p. 66.

‡ Hymn 204.

her greatness. "What dignity can be too great to attribute to her who is as closely bound up, as intimately one, with the Eternal Word, as a mother is with a son?" But Dr. Newman also maintains that "she holds, as the Fathers teach us, that office in our restoration which Eve held in our fall;"* and his conclusion finds expression in the following Hymn (No. 205):

"O my tongue, the praise and honours
Of the Mother-maid rehearse,
Whose Divine and gracious offspring
Freed us from the olden curse.
Lost are we in loving wonder
While her bliss we contemplate,
Happy as a stainless Mother,
Blessed in her Virgin state.
Eve's transgression closed the portals
Of earth's Paradise to man;
But at Mary's meek obedience
Heaven to ope its gates began.
We through Eve received the sentence
With eternal vengeance rife;
But the way, that came through Mary,
Leads to Everlasting Life.
Mother, yet a stainless Virgin,
He who deigned thy Son to be,
Is the King of kings, and Maker
Of the sky and earth and sea."

From this theory of her relation to the Eternal Word the duty of devotion flows irresistibly. Mr. Keble felt this, and expressed it long ago in the "Christian Year;" and the last faint tinge of Protestant suspicion is seen in the "cautel,"

Ave Maria, thou whose name
All but adoring love may claim;

and now this hymn is sung in the high-ritual churches by congregations with whom Dr. Newman will plead that the Catholic Church never demanded for her a higher love or devotion than that which is accorded to her by the author of the "Christian Year." Sooner or later, we may be sure, he will not plead in vain. A dread of Mariolatry is perhaps the last barrier that has withheld Dr. Pusey from following

* Remarks, p. 47.

his old friend ; and from his own point of view the object which he dreads is simply a bugbear.

The parties in the Church of England cannot very long retain their present position. The conflict between the Sacerdotalists and the Puritans can scarcely end in the predominance of the latter. The old fervour of the so-called Evangelicals is gone ; and their antagonists exultingly affirm that in this struggle "the Puritan party is nowhere." The progress of knowledge and the advance of art have placed them at a disadvantage, against which their lack of organization makes it hopeless for them to contend. Even the Bishop of London is constrained to admit that men are tired of their dismal and monotonous religion, and will no longer abide the tedious duets which gladdened the hearts of Evangelical preachers and congregations fifty years ago. But it is otherwise with those who by way of either praise or blame are called Liberals and Rationalists. They may not exhibit many of the elements of a party ; but the principles which guide them in their criticisms and on which they modify their belief are capable of indefinite expansion, and an application of their method may perhaps guide us out of difficulties which at present appear inextricable. The Eucharistic doctrine rests on the Incarnation ; and the Incarnation, as set forth in this theory, involves the transcendent glories of Mary as the Mother of God, or, as the Hymn phrases it, the nurse of her Creator. No interposition of bishops, no Acts of Parliament prohibiting processions, crucifixes, candles, vestments and incense, can crush or kill these doctrines ; and it would be a lasting disgrace to English society in the nineteenth century if any persecution is employed in their suppression. But that which legislation cannot do, may be done, if English Churchmen will say plainly that they do not admit the title of Theotocos, or acknowledge the inferences drawn from it, even though these may come with all the authority of an Ecumenical Council. The Articles of the Church of England do not require the clergy to maintain the supernatural generation of Christ ; and a categorical denial of the truth of the narratives contained in the opening chapters of the first and third Gospels, might be the means of bringing about a judicial decision which would scatter the remaining doubts of the sacerdotalists. It is open to the clergy of the Established Church to maintain

that the idea of a supernatural generation was either unknown or distasteful to the writer of the fourth Gospel ; that this idea was likewise unknown to those who framed the genealogies in St. Matthew and St. Luke ; that these genealogies and the narratives with which they are combined are utterly self-contradictory ; that the Church of England cannot expect her clergy or laity to believe or to uphold a mass of impossibilities ; and, finally, that the assertion of the ordinary generation of Jesus Christ is in no way inconsistent with the terms of the Athanasian Creed.

With the existing law of the Church of England, the decision in such a case must be that the clergy are free to maintain that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary by ordinary generation ; and although such a decision need in no way disturb the belief that Christ is the Eternal Logos who "was made flesh and dwelt among us full of grace and truth," it might perhaps convince the sacerdotalists that their theories of the Incarnation and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice can find no genial soil in the Anglican Establishment, and that the time was come to seek a home elsewhere.*

But if even from such a decision they should find a way of escape not unlike that by which the Bishop of Exeter justified his passive submission to the Gorham judgment, at the least their high pretensions of Catholicising the Church of England must be modified or abandoned ; and in either

* It must not, however, be supposed that if the Ritualists choose to remain in the Establishment on the same footing with other contending parties within its pale, the liberal school would raise any objection. Every one who really upholds the principle of comprehension—in other words, of compromise—for its own sake, must approve the language of the Dean of Westminster, when in his place in Convocation, Feb. 9, 1866, he said that "the contradictions which were to be found between the Canons and the Prayer Book shewed that there was a diversity from the earliest time in the English Church, and he trusted that neither of the two greater parties existing in the Church would succeed in what they both had often tried, viz. to oust the other, and that they would be unsuccessful to the end of time. The National Church, to be really national, should have within its pale, as far as practicable with unity, a variety of opinions, and this was a source of strength." But the Ritualists do not want to be "comprehended." Their avowed design is to Catholicise the Church, and so to make the position of all other parties untenable. To remain on any other terms would be a virtual abandonment of their whole system. The words of Dean Stanley suffice, however, to shew (if any evidence were needed) that in any efforts which may be made to abridge the legal liberty of the Ritualists, no aid is to be expected from the Broad Church or liberal members of the Establishment.

case the high ritualism which is now shooting forth great branches would wither away and die.

We may, however, anticipate with confidence that the raising of such a question by the clergy would be followed by wider and deeper changes, which would render it necessary to determine the fundamental idea of ritual and worship, and the possibility of applying it in a system not based on an expiatory Eucharist and a sacrificial priesthood.

PRESBYTER ANGLICANUS.

V.—THE GOSPEL QUESTION.—1. THE FOURTH GOSPEL

SCHLEIERMACHER stated as follows the obvious difficulty which presents itself on the most superficial comparison of the first three Gospels with the fourth, considered as sources of the life of Christ: "The Gospel of John has from the first been attributed to an immediate disciple of Christ—a judgment so ancient that we may almost accept it as a personal testimony. But so likewise has the Gospel of Matthew been ascribed to another of the twelve disciples. The remaining two Gospels have not been so attributed. The difficulty is, however, presented to us in all its completeness upon the comparison of Matthew and John only. For both these authors must have been companions of Christ during his public life, and have belonged to the number of his every-day associates. What explanation then can be given of the fact, that the one sets forth a collection of separate narratives wherein so little is presented of that which is related by the other; while this other rather gives a connected Gospel, wherein very little appears of the particulars which the former has brought together?"*

The problem concerning the possibility of reconciling the Synoptics with the fourth Gospel is here set forth with sufficient fairness upon the assumption of the genuineness

* Das Leben Jesu. Vorlesungen an der Universität zu Berlin im Jahr 1832 gehalten von Dr. Friedrich Schleiermacher. Aus Schleiermacher's handschriftlichem Nachlasse herausgegeben von K. A. Rügenik. Berlin: 1864. P. 41.

and authenticity, in the main, of at least two of the Gospels, especially of the genuineness and authenticity of the fourth. Now that even Schleiermacher should have made that assumption so roundly, appears at the present day surprising. The lectures from which the above passage is taken were delivered, it is true, in the year 1832, and therefore before the publication of the first great work of Strauss. But the unhesitating manner in which the fourth Gospel is assigned to the apostle John can only be accounted for by theological prepossessions, when already in 1820 Bretschneider had so seriously shaken the conviction of its genuineness.*

It cannot be denied, as Bretschneider observed at the outset of his Dissertation, that if the fourth Gospel had been discovered to the Christian world in our own times after lying hid for eighteen centuries, it would have been at once and universally acknowledged that the description of Jesus therein given, and that of Matthew, Mark and Luke, could not both of them be true. It might be said with equal reason, *vice versa*, that could the fourth Gospel be supposed to have been current and the Synoptics to have been unknown until disinterred in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, they would have been set very much on the footing of our present Apocryphal Gospels. Whichever of the accounts, the Johannean or the Synoptic, had obtained possession of the ground, it would undoubtedly, in the case supposed, have effectually excluded the other in the particulars wherein they differ. Now if this would have been reasonable in the supposed case, it will be reasonable also as a critical hypothesis. And, as a critical hypothesis, it will stand, first on the one leg and then on the other; that is to say, first on the acceptance of the Johannean narrative, it will infer the incompatibility of the Synoptic account in some portions; and again, on the acceptance of the Synoptic account, it will reject the Johannean. Criticism must conclude that the accounts where they conflict cannot both be true, but may both be false; while, on the other hand, if the one account be given up as insufficiently substantiated, it may be supposed possible to fall back upon the other, and thus a partial examination limited to the Synoptics, or

* *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Joannis Apostoli Indole et Origine Eruditorum Judicii modeste subjecit Carolus Theoph. Bretschneider, Theol. Doct. etc. etc. Lipsiæ: 1820.*

to some portions of them, may be conducted the more courageously, because of a tacit assumption that the fourth Gospel presents the undoubted evidence of an eye-witness. Or, again, this latter may be abandoned with the less reluctance, if the earlier accounts remain uncontroverted. In these latter cases, however, though either life of Christ may by different persons be esteemed historical, both will not be so esteemed by the same persons or at one and the same time.

The mere comparison, therefore, of the agreements and discrepancies between the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel will conduct us but very little way towards ascertaining the extent of the true historical element in either, so long as we start from such a prepossession as that acknowledged by Schleiermacher concerning the authorship of the first Gospel and the fourth. Moreover, the whole question is complicated by the extent to which theological considerations modify in infinite variety critical processes and conclusions. Of these we will now mention only one. The purely critical conclusion that two discrepant accounts cannot both be true, is modified in many minds by this reflection, that if one of the Gospel accounts be sufficiently established as presenting the undoubted evidence of credible eye-witnesses, there is proved the general fact of a supernatural intervention, which takes the Gospel histories out of the category of ordinary histories, and exempts them from the application of those strict rules of criticism to which other narratives are properly subjected. In many minds a result substantially the same is produced by the mere *claim* set up on behalf of these narratives (though not in the narratives themselves), that they contain an authentic account of a supernatural revelation. And further, this claim is alleged to be made by "the Church," or the true representatives of the Church, which is said to be the "key and keeper of Holy Writ." For "the Church" is supposed by many to be itself supernaturally gifted, so as to preclude all error on a subject so essential as the authenticity of the narratives of the life of Christ. It is, however, obvious that we have as yet no definition of "the Church;" nor test whereby we can know "the true Church;" nor means of ascertaining where its voice and judgment are to be heard; nor evidence of any supernaturally communicated intelligence residing, either in "the Church" diffusively, or in any

organ thereof. It is evidently arguing in a circle, if in its turn the claim of "the Church" to a supernatural intelligence be based upon the very books whose supernatural character can be vouched for in turn by itself, and by itself only.

It is indeed urged that the very existence of "the Church," in the loosest sense of the word, the existence of Christianity at all, implies the authenticity of the Gospel histories—for, it is said, Christianity must have had a sufficient cause and a historical origin, and none such can be alleged unless the facts as related in the Gospels were substantiated by the evidence of eye-witnesses. Undoubtedly every association of men, whether religious or other, which has had a continuous existence, must have had a sufficient cause and an actual commencement in history. But not necessarily that cause or origin to which it has appealed in later periods of its corporate life. We should not be driven to deny the patent existence of Christianity, however destructive our Gospel criticism might prove, any more than we should be compelled to disbelieve the present existence and long-continued succession of the Masonic Brotherhood, because we esteem the story of Hiram and his workmen to be a mere legend, or because we may really be unable to point out with precision the historical moment at which that association commenced. Nor, again, can it be doubted that sufficient natural causes operated to the most wonderful extension of the Buddhist religion, in opposition to a powerful hierarchy and the prejudices of a caste system, several centuries before the Christian era; although we must reject as legendary and purely fictitious the greater part of its earlier history, and even the greater part of the history of Buddha Sakyamuni himself. It is, however, sometimes urged with a certain plausibility, that without admitting as yet any supernatural intelligence or authority in "the Church," we are bound to accept the "tradition" of the Church on historical principles; that is to say, that we are bound to believe a society which has existed from the very origin of Christianity, when it affirms that it has handed down certain books intact from that original time itself. Now if the claim for the Church be divested of all its supernatural pretensions, and the "tradition" of the Church be simply understood in the sense of the material handing down of the books by the Christians who lived during a

certain period, we are able to accept that as fairly raising an issue essential to our inquiry into the genuineness and authenticity of the Gospels. Divested of all assumptions on one side or the other, the issue will be simply this—Is there sufficient historical evidence of the authorship of the four Gospels by the persons whose names they bear? Or it may be varied thus: Have we in the four Gospels the written evidence of eye-witnesses of the events related? or thus: In what proximity to the events related was the composition of our four Gospels? It is evident that the inquiry which thus lies before us must be conducted with respect to each of the Gospels severally; and we shall not have to encumber ourselves with tracing what is called the history of the Canon. That a book was comprised in the Canon at a certain date is no doubt proof of its existence at the time. But it will be conceded on all hands that the books concerning which we are now to inquire were already extant before any formal determination of the Canon took place. The earliest general council which canonized the books of the New Testament (κεκανονισμένα βιβλία) was that of Constantinople, A.D. 691; the earliest provincial council which did so, that of Laodicea, A.D. 363. Nor do any fluctuations in later times concerning the reception of other books affect the question of the authorship of the Gospels, which it may be acknowledged were received at the close of the second century.

It has been observed with justice, as by Credner,* that the organization of the "Catholic Church" and the definition of the Canon advanced *pari passu*. We are not now inquiring whether the idea of a Catholic Church was not vitiated very soon after it was distinctly conceived, by the limitations which followed from the dogmatic principle; we are by no means denying that such was the case. But the characteristic of the nascent Catholicity of the second century was comprehensiveness and not exclusion; while it was characteristic of the "heretical" schools to maintain that they only were respectively in possession of the absolute truth. A remarkable exemplification of the operation of these contrary principles is to be seen in the opposite manner in which the Gospels were dealt with on the one

* Geschichte d. neutestamentlichen Kanon. ed. Volkmar. Berlin: 1860. 1 Buch, 4 Kap. p. 25.

hand by the heretical, on the other by the Catholicising parties; for the Ebionites received the Gospel of Matthew; Marcion that of Luke; the Cerinthians, Mark; and the Valentinians, John; whereas the Catholic Church received the four.* The reasons which Irenæus alleged for receiving neither more nor fewer than four Gospels may appear to us altogether puerile, and we shall have to notice them presently. But the fact remains, that as the bulk of Christendom organized itself into one Church out of several societies originally more or less distinct, it rejected the exclusive Gospels of extreme parties, although it approved Gospels, such as the existing four, written by no means from one and the same point of view. There were extant also a considerable number of Gospels since called Apocryphal. But the difficulty of drawing a line between these and the Canonical Gospels has, we think, been frequently exaggerated. It is true, there is a certain connecting resemblance between Matthew i. ii., Luke i. ii., and the Apocryphal Gospels of the Infancy. But if those portions of our first and third Gospels be separated from the rest—and they were absent not only from Marcion's Gospel but from the Diatessaron of Tatian—the Canonical Gospels will be seen to stand on a literary level far above the Apocryphal narratives. Whatever we may ultimately conclude as to the consistency and truthfulness, or otherwise, of the representations given in the Canonical Gospels of the person of the Saviour, they are representations infinitely more worthy of their object than those which meet us in the Apocryphal legends. Not that these latter have been without their influence upon popular Christianity, deep and lasting. They have been the source, as M. Nicolas well expresses it, of the mythology of Christianity† during the whole medieval period; and in many countries down to the present day they have given shape to the beliefs of large masses, through preaching, and poetry, and "mysteries," and the painter's art. They are, however, totally devoid of external evidence as to their authorship, and their narratives are altogether unworthy of serious attention for their own sakes: they have only an occasional evidential value, in that they

* Iren. adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 11.

† *Études sur les Évangiles Apocryphes*, par Michel Nicolas, Paris, 1866, p. xxiv.

imply the pre-existence of a history of which they are the development, or rather the caricature. These observations respecting the Apocryphal Gospels are only made in order to clear ourselves from any suspicion of confounding the evidence which can be produced concerning their origin with that which may be alleged for the Canonical Gospels. It would not follow, if the genuineness and authenticity of the Canonical Gospels could be established to the fullest extent, that the Apocryphal Gospels, or any of them that we know, must also be accounted genuine and authentic; nor if the Apocryphal Gospels be untraceable to any personal authors and entirely unworthy of credit, does it thence follow that the Canonical Gospels must be so likewise. Whatever positive value may or not be found to belong to the judgment of Irenæus at the close of the second century, it sufficiently narrows the Gospel question to an inquiry concerning the authorship and credibility of our four Canonical Gospels. All but four are surrendered, and a peculiar and definite claim is set up for the four. Can it be sufficiently substantiated?

An inquiry concerning the authorship of the historical books of the New Testament and the credibility of their contents presents several observable differences from a similar investigation with regard to the books of the Old Testament. The composition of the Gospels, regarded merely in the most superficial manner, approaches much nearer the supposed date of the events related in them, than the compilation of the historical books of the Old Testament to the histories therein recorded. The latter are on the face of them anonymous; the Gospels, as soon as they appear, or can be presumed to have appeared in their present shape, are known by the names which are now affixed to them. The books, so called, of Moses are the only historical books of the Old Testament which bear the name of a supposed contemporary author; but we have no external evidence in support of that authorship for many hundreds of years subsequent to the time at which he may be taken to have lived. We shall find the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, attributed currently to those authors at from 100 to 150 years from the occurrences described in them. Moreover, in the case of the New Testament history, the evidence of eye-witnesses, if it can be had, is of

infinitely greater consequence than with the ancient Jewish history. For the miraculous portion of the narrative is more essential in the New Testament than in the Old. Its mere proportion in bulk to the rest of the historical narrative is much greater, and its relative importance still more preponderating. For if the miracles were withdrawn from the Old Testament histories, the coherence of the secular and providential history of the Jewish people would not thereby be impaired. The Exodus would remain and its consequences, though it were not preceded by the plagues of Egypt, or accompanied by a miraculous passage of the Red Sea: the battle of Beth-horon will still have been one of the decisive battles in the world's history, although it were not signalized by a divine intervention arresting the course of the heavenly bodies: the miracles of Elijah and Elisha, if taken out of the history, would leave absolutely no gap in it, as is seen by their omission in the Books of Chronicles. So little essential indeed is the miraculous element to the providential march of the history of the Hebrew race, that it only appears in their traditions as operating spasmodically and at long intervals, while the period more immediately preparatory to the advent of Christianity is not supposed to have presented any trace of it. On the other hand, what a gap would be left in the Gospel history if the miracles of the Gospels were found to be unauthenticated! Much more than that; for there would be necessitated, not the simplification of a history, but the reconstruction of a creed. Some at least of the miraculous events recorded are usually considered as absolutely fundamental to the Christian belief, and the revolution will be great if the evidence concerning them should reach no further than to shew the record as a product of belief, but not sufficient for a basis of belief or monument of actual facts. While the Gospel question, therefore, far surpasses in interest, and gathers into a focus, all other Biblical questions, the period over which the inquiry extends is limited, the literary products concerning which the verdict is to be given is of no great bulk, and the literary material wherein the external evidence is to be sought is of no enormous bulk either. All which tends to make the inquiry on which we are venturing to enter sharp, vital, close and decisive.

But with what portion of our material shall we com-

mence? The Gospels are not homogeneous; which, therefore, of the elements, the Synoptical or the Johannean, shall we attempt first to ascertain? The Synoptics were undoubtedly first in order of time, and for the purpose of teaching or delivering a system it would be natural to commence with them. But for the purpose of an analysis of the Gospel material, it will present some advantages to begin with the more recent, with the stratum which was last in the order of literary deposition. We are starting from a general consent at the end of the second century concerning the authorship of all four Gospels; we shall better trace the antecedents of that general consent by working our way backward and up the stream of time and tradition. We shall thus engage ourselves first in the examination of the evidence, external and internal, for the genuineness and authenticity of the fourth Gospel, which was confessedly the last composed. The problem also which is presented by the fourth Gospel is more simple than that which lies before us in the Synoptics, and it will be well to have solved, as far as may be possible, the more simple problem, before advancing to the more complex. Again, it is claimed for the fourth Gospel, and it seems to claim for itself, that it was the work of an apostle, and therefore of an eye-witness of the events which it relates, which very few will maintain of any other, even of the first Gospel as we now have it. Consequently the authority of the fourth Gospel must stand either much higher or much lower than that of the Synoptics. It is therefore necessary to verify or disallow its pretensions before we can engage satisfactorily in an investigation of the other histories; for we cannot move freely or rightly in that investigation until we know whether in the fourth Gospel we have an absolutely controlling authority, or controlling to some extent, or not at all.

For these reasons it is intended to commence the present discussion with an inquiry into the genuineness and authenticity of the fourth Gospel. In this and the ensuing papers the terms genuine and authentic will be used, the former to signify that a book was written by the person whose name it bears, and in opposition to spurious; the latter, to import the historical character or truthfulness of its contents, in contradistinction to unhistorical or fictitious. Our ultimate object is to ascertain, as far as the evidence will carry us,

the authenticity or otherwise of the Gospel narratives. The genuineness of a work is of different degrees of weight in establishing its authenticity, according to circumstances. The genuineness of a work purporting to be the composition of an eye-witness of the events related, is of vital importance relatively to its authenticity: genuineness in such a case, other qualifications of the historian being supposed, will carry us a long way towards proof of the authenticity of its contents. The spuriousness of a history purporting to be written by an eye-witness would detract in an equal ratio from its credibility. Bearing in mind then the ultimate object of these inquiries, which is to determine whether there be proof of the events narrated in the Gospel histories having actually occurred, we shall remember that an equal stringency is requisite in the proof of every link in the demonstration. If we are to be absolutely certain of our conclusion, we must be absolutely certain of all the steps which lead to it; or if in conducting an historical inquiry we must be content to accept probable results, we must not then be tempted to be satisfied on particular points with bare possibilities.

It is quite true—and we should carry it in our minds, for the sake of its bearing upon different sides of our investigation—that the testimony to which we shall have to refer does not lie square with the question we have to decide; it is not direct, nor does it supply categorical answers to our interrogations. The witnesses we summon are thinking of something else. Hence on the one side is a great deficiency in what we should desire to hear from them, and at the same time a trustworthiness which might not be accorded to them, if they were conscious of the natural inferences either from their expressions or their silence.

We commence, therefore, with Irenæus, whose martyrdom occurred early in the third century. His evidence is by many thought to be conclusive to the authorship of the fourth Gospel by the apostle John, because he states himself to have seen Polycarp "in his early youth,"* and there appears thus only one link between the Father and the apostolic author. Now by some the whole evidence of

* ὅν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐωράκαμεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ, *Adv. Hæc. lib. iii. c. 3, § 4.*

Irenæus is objected to as altogether worthless on account of the fanciful millenarian notions entertained by him, which shew him to have been a person devoid of sound judgment; on the other hand, it is urged that these speculative opinions cannot suffice to invalidate his testimony as to a plain matter of fact coming under his own observation. And it may be added that his very millenarian opinions, which cannot easily be made to coincide with the doctrines of the fourth Gospel, confirm the supposition that he must have had very sufficient reasons for accepting its Johannean authorship: he must have believed it not because, but in spite, of his millenarian notions. The weakness, however, of the judgment of Irenæus will suffice to neutralize this latter consideration, for he may not have perceived that there was any difficulty in reconciling the eschatology which he adopted with the doctrine of the fourth Gospel. What now is the matter of fact to which the testimony of Irenæus is required? That he had learnt from Polycarp that the fourth Gospel was the work of the apostle John. What is the fact in connection with Polycarp to which his testimony reaches? That he had seen and associated with Polycarp in his early youth. In the passages where Irenæus spoke of Polycarp, he was not treating of the Gospels, but alleging him as a link in the apostolic doctrine generally, and undoubtedly rather of the orally delivered than of the written doctrine. He says, "And Polycarp, a man who had been instructed by the apostles, and had familiar intercourse with many that had seen Christ—whom we also have seen in our youth, for he lived a long time—he always taught what he learned from the apostles, what the Church had handed down, and what is the only true doctrine."* And in his Epistle to Florinus, "I can tell also the very place where the blessed Polycarp was accustomed to sit and discourse, and also his entrances, his walks, the complexion of his life, and the form of his body, and his conversations with the people and his familiar intercourse with John, as he was accustomed to tell, as also his familiarity with those who had seen the Lord. How also he used to relate their discourses, and what things he had heard from them concerning the

* Adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 8. Euseb. H. E. lib. iv. c. 14.

Lord.”* And then he applies it all to this effect—that if that holy man had heard the doctrines against which Irenæus was warning Florinus, he would have stopped his ears or exclaimed in horror. The question of the written Gospels is certainly not here before Irenæus, and as certainly he is making not the least allusion to it: when the question is before him, and the testimony of Polycarp would have been conclusive, there is not the remotest hint of an appeal to it. So that it seems to us altogether unwarrantable for M. de Pressensé to argue in a recent work, “L’Evêque de Lyon ne s’exprimerait pas avec une si entière certitude sur l’évangile de Jean, si Polycarp ne lui en avait pas parlé; le silence de son maître sur un tel livre eût été pour lui une raison de douter sur son authenticité; il lui eût interdit les affirmations catégoriques.”† It is certainly very bold indeed to pretend to determine what a person like Irenæus would or would not have done under supposed circumstances. Irenæus is called upon to produce the evidence of Polycarp, and he does not produce it. He says, indeed, elsewhere, but without alleging any authority, that “John, the disciple of our Lord, the same that lay upon his bosom, also published the Gospel, while he was yet at Ephesus in Asia.” But considering this assertion concerning the authorship of the Gospel is made at a distance of from 80 to 90 years from the death of the apostle, and at a distance of more than that from the composition of the book, if the apostle composed it, we cannot allow any force to it in itself;—much less, a counterbalancing weight against the fact of the silence in which, as we shall see, it must have lain for 60 or 70 years from its composition, were it composed by the apostle.

We will now only quote briefly some of the arguments with which Irenæus undertakes to prove that there can be neither more nor fewer than four Gospels. “There are four quarters of the world, and four principal winds, and the Church is spread over all the earth, and is the pillar of the truth and the breath of life; *whence it follows* that it has four columns breathing immortality.” “And from this it

* Euseb. H. E. lib. v. c. 20.

† Jesus-Christ, son Temps, sa Vie, son Œuvre, par E. de Pressensé. Paris: 1866. P. 225.

is manifest that he who sitteth above the Cherubim hath given us a fourfold Gospel—as David, ‘Thou that sittest above the Cherubim’ (Ps. lxxx. 1); for the Cherubim are fourfold, and their forms are an image of the dispensation of the Son of God.” And after much more of the same kind, “We have shewn there can be neither more nor fewer than four Gospels by so many and great reasons, *per tot et tanta ostendimus*.” So far, therefore, as Irenæus is concerned, we fairly gather no more than this—that the fourth Gospel was extant at the close of the second century, and was then, though rejected by others, received by the Valentinians and the Catholics as the work of the apostle.

The evidence of Theophilus of Antioch is, next to that of Irenæus, the most relied on and the most to the point: he refers expressly to the words in the commencement of the fourth Gospel, and attributes them to John. He does not indeed say the “apostle” John, and it is very possible that a confusion between the two Johns, John the apostle and John the presbyter of Ephesus,† may lie at the root of the tradition concerning the apostolic authorship of the Gospel. But however that may be, it is only fair to acknowledge that the Gospel is accepted as an inspired authority by Theophilus, who is said to have been himself sixth in succession from the apostles—an evidence which carries us back to from 180 to 170 after Christ.‡ There is also an allusion to Satan inciting Cain to become the murderer of his brother,§ but with no apparent verbal reference to John viii. 44, or 1 John iii. 12; and a certain parallel, but nothing more, between *ἐὰν κύκκος σίτου ἐπιβληθῇ εἰς τὴν γῆν*,|| and John xii. 24 and 1 Cor. xv. 36, 37.

The testimony of the fragment known by the name of Muratori will come in here. It may be taken, for our present purpose, as a list of the books of the New Testament currently received in the Roman Church at the time of its composition about 170—180. The date of the original list, of

* Adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 11, § 7.

† See Euseb. E.H. lib. iii. c. 39.

‡ The whole passage referred to is—“Ὅθεν διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς αἱ θγιαὶ γραφαὶ καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει· ‘Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν· δεικνύς ὅτι ἐν πρώτοις μόνος ἦν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος. “Ἐπειτα λέγει· Καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος· πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν.—Ad Autol. lib. ii. c. 22.

§ Lib. ii. c. 29.

|| Lib. i. c. 13.

which the present fragment is a copy, is supposed to be ascertained by a reference to Pius, bishop of Rome, whose brother Hermias is said to have written the Pastor, "nuperrime nostris temporibus sedente cathedra urbis Romæ ecclesiæ Pio episcopo," that is to say, about 142—157. This may certainly be a mistake concerning the authorship of the Pastor, and yet serve for some indication of the date of composition of the list itself: at the same time the "nuperrime nostris temporibus" must not be pressed too closely, so that the date of the list cannot well be anterior to that above given. The Gospel itself may then be inferred to have been necessarily extant and current some time previously, or in the middle of the second century. The passage relating to the Gospel is as follows: "The fourth Gospel John of the disciples (wrote), to his fellow-disciples and his bishops exhorting him, he said, Fast ye together with me to-day for three days, and whatever shall have been revealed to any, we will relate to each other. In the same night it was revealed to Andrew of the apostles that, with the approval of all, John should describe all things in his own name."*

The testimony here conveyed is, it will be observed, anonymous, while the legend connected with the authorship of the fourth Gospel shews that we are at the very birth of the tradition concerning it. Whatever may be the intrinsic claims of the Gospel, this story of an impossible assembly of apostles and bishops, with no indication of time or place, the fast, the revelation to Andrew, the common consent, is of no more literary or historical worth than the tales which meet us in the apocryphal Gospels. Like them, it is addressed to the *vulgus*. By its very puerility it indicates a set purpose to recommend and account for a composition which required to be recommended and accounted for. And without pressing a charge of *pia fraus* too far, here is evidence, not so much of a belief entertained, as of a belief intended to be impressed. Nevertheless, the net naked result will be, that the fourth Gospel was actually current in the Western Church, though on what authority we know not,

* "Quartum Evangeliorum Joannes ex discipulis. Cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis dixit; conjejunate mihi hodie triduo et quid cuique fuerit revelatum alterutri nobis enarremus. Eadem nocte revelatum Andres ex apostolis, ut, recognoscentibus cunctis, Joannes suo nomine cuncta describeret."—Credner.

and on what grounds we know not, at the middle of the second century.

The foregoing is the whole of the evidence in the second century expressly referring the Gospel to an apostolic author. But a species of evidence is certainly supposable, of an indirect character indeed, yet which might, if it were found sufficiently ample, supplement the meagreness of the direct testimony and carry it upward, till we touched the very age at which the apostle was living and writing. Are there then citations or references to the Gospel, or to doctrines, facts, or formulas of expression contained in it, in the course of the second century, from which its apostolic authorship and authority might be fairly inferred, though not proclaimed in terms? The books in which references of this kind will be sought for may be taken in the following order: Tatian, Athenagoras, the Pastor of Hermas, the Sibylline Oracles, Justin Martyr, Polycarp, Ignatius and Clement of Rome.

Tatian is spoken of contemptuously by Irenæus as having fallen away from the true faith after the martyrdom of his master Justin, and as having become the head of the sect of the Encratites. He published also a "Diatessaron" or Gospel of the four, or from the four, in which he is said to have taken some liberties with the diction of the apostles.* We do not indeed know anything further of this Diatessaron. Yet the very title of it may be sufficient to confirm the conclusion at which we have already arrived, that there were four Gospels specially recognized in the latter half of the second century. There is, however, extant an address of Tatian's to the Greeks, which was anciently well esteemed, and which supplies some illustrations of the phraseology of the fourth Gospel, particularly in respect of the language used concerning the "Word." Yet it presents at the same time remarkable contrasts; for though it employs some of the same phrases, undoubtedly it does not set forth the same doctrine. In Tatian, the doctrine of the Logos, or Divine Reason, indwelling potentially in God, and as forthcoming called his first work, is not connected, as in John i. 14, with the "Word made flesh," but only with the Christian belief concerning the divine creation of all things. The Logos is, as it

* Euseb. E. H. lib. iv. c. 29.

were, the first of all production, forthgoing not by necessity, but by will of the Father; nor is the creation of the world ascribed to the Logos even instrumentally. Thus Tatian exhorts the heathens to "follow the only God. All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made"—spoken of God, and not, as in John i. 3, of the "Word."* Another remarkable contrast is in his use of the word Θεός, where if he had followed the fourth Gospel as an authority we should have expected λόγος, when he says, "We are telling no foolish tales in announcing that God became in form of man."† So likewise, as if purposely varying the first words of the fourth Gospel, supposing it to have been before him, "God was in the beginning, and by beginning we understand power of Reason."‡ Elsewhere he sets forth the doctrine that the soul is not immortal of itself, but mortal, capable nevertheless of immortality if led up to it by the Spirit: the soul is naturally dark, but receives illumination from the Divine Reason or Spirit. And he says, "This will be the meaning of the saying, The darkness comprehendeth not the light."§ If the passage is to be taken as referring to John i. 5, it appears to be a misapplication, and to involve also a contradiction to ver. 9. It is, however, more probable that τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ ἐρημένον is not to be understood as a formula of citation from the Gospel, but as an application of a current phrase which might be applied in various ways by various writers or teachers. And so he employs the proposition, "God is a Spirit," where he is explaining that God is not to be taken as a Soul of the world, but as the Ordainer and Constitutor of all things,|| and in an entirely different connection from that in which it is used in John iv. 24.

* Θεῷ τῷ μόνῳ κατακολουθήσατε. Πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἓν.—α. 19. p. 88. ed. Otto.

† Οὐ γὰρ μωραίνομεν, οὐδὲ λήρουε ἀπαγγέλλομεν, θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ μορφῇ γεγονέναι καταγγέλλοντες.—α. 21. id. p. 90.

‡ Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν λόγου δύνάμιν παρελήφαμεν.—α. 5. p. 21.

§ Καθ' ἑαυτὴν γὰρ σκότος ἐστὶν καὶ οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ φωτεῖνόν. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἀρα τὸ ἐρημένον Ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει. ψυχὴ γὰρ οὐκ αὕτη τὸ πνεῦμα ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ φῶς τὴν σκοτίαν καταλαβεν. Ἡ λόγος μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ φῶς, σκότος δὲ ἡ ἀνεπιστήμων ψυχὴ.—α. 13. p. 60.

|| Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, οὐ δίκηκον διὰ τῆς ὕλης, πνευμάτων δὲ ὕλικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ σχημάτων κατασκευαστός.—α. 4.

The parallels to our fourth Gospel to be met with in Athenagoras present much greater consistency and superior clearness, both in phrase and in conception of doctrine. His "Supplicatio" was addressed to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (Philosophus), and Lucius Aurelius Commodus, his son, anno 177.* He speaks of God as having "made all things by his Word."† It will be remembered we are quoting these passages not for any doctrinal purpose, but in an historical inquiry, in order to ascertain what, or whether any, currency and apostolic authorship, or authority, of the fourth Gospel is implied by them; and we have added the Greek words generally below, because in that way the parallelism or divergence from the Gospel is much more easily traceable. Thus the "Son of God" and the "Word of God" are identified; and one place, "Since the Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son by a spiritual unity and power, the Son of God is the intelligence and Word of the Father," puts us in mind for a moment of the text, John xvii. 21, "As thou, Father, art in me," &c., but without following up the thought which ensues.‡ Also when giving a rationale of the Christian doctrine, or developing it in order to its defence, while substantially agreeing, we may say, with the fourth Gospel; the author curiously avoids giving any indication that he is either copying or relying upon it.§ And it certainly is most remarkable that in confirmation of the Christian doctrine concerning the divinity — τὸ θεολογικὸν μέρος — and especially of the doctrine of the λόγος, where he is resenting the imputation of atheism, he does not refer to our fourth Gospel either to prove the truth of the doctrine, or to prove it was an acknowledged tenet of the Christians, but quotes Prov. viii. 22, Κύριος γὰρ ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ. We have thus in Athenagoras, who surpasses all the Apologists

* Otto Prolegomena ad Athenagoræ Opp. pp. lxx—lxxv.

† Πάντα διὰ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγου πεποιηκότα.—c. 4. ὅφ' οὐ γεγέννητας τὸ πᾶν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου.—c. 10.

‡ ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ.—c. 10. ὄντος δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐν πατρὶ καὶ πατρὸς ἐν υἱῷ ἐνότητι καὶ δυνάμει πνεύματος, νοῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.—Id.

§ Ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ θεός, νοῦς ἀίδιος ὦν εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον αἰδίως λογικὸς ὢν.—Id. τίς οὖν οὐκ ἀπορήσει, λέγοντας θεὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν θεόν καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει δύναμιν καὶ ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν, ἀκούσας ἀθέους καλοσμύνοους.—Id.

in philosophic and literary qualifications, a developed scheme, which yet does not appear to have been derived from the fourth Gospel as its sole or apostolic source ; there is no recognition of the apostle as an evangelist, nor of the book itself, nor of the history contained in it.

We may next take the Pastor of Hermas. This was quoted as scripture by Irenæus, and esteemed a sacred book by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. We express no opinion whether it were written or not by the Hermas to whom it is attributed in the Muratorian list ; but if it were at all of the date there implied, and the fourth Gospel were the work of the apostle, it would be very strange that no reference should be made thereto in a composition of so great extent. A few expressions only have a remote correspondence with others in the fourth Gospel ; as when the Son of God is called "the gate of entrance into the kingdom of heaven."* But the most noteworthy, and indeed only noteworthy passage, for our present purpose, is a well-known one in which the Shepherd declares it allowable for a husband to condone the adultery of a penitent wife—whence the appellation bestowed upon the book by some of the stricter Fathers—"Pastor ille Mœchorum." But although there may be a certain correspondence in the sentiment, yet there is by no means a parallelism, nor is any reference made to John viii 3—11, which would have supplied an authority.† And this is the whole which can be said of Hermas.

A quotation of "words of the Lord" is given in the Letter from the Churches in Vienna and Lugdunum on occasion of the persecution anno 177, corresponding with John xvi. 2, and an allusion seems also made to John vii 38.‡ And—for the sake of not omitting anything—the passage attributed to Apollinaris of Hierapolis (circ. 172), in a perished work on the passover, καὶ στασιάσειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια, would apparently imply the existence both of

* Lib. iii. Sim. 9, § 12, 13.

† There are considerable doubts, as is well known, whether the passage *de adulterâ* was originally part of the Gospel, and the evidence of MSS. is nearly equally divided ; it must, however, be acknowledged in favour of the genuineness of the passage, that the omission of it, if genuine, is more easily accounted for than the insertion of it if spurious.

‡ Euseb. E. H. lib. v. c. 1.

the fourth Gospel and of the first, between which a difference as to the day of the Lord's paschal supper has been observed.*

The books known as the Sibylline Oracles may next be noticed. Additions continued to be made to this work far into the third century ;† in other parts it is of the second, and may contain some ancient portions even of the first age. We meet in it with passages in which a doctrine not dissimilar from the Logos doctrine of the fourth Gospel is expressed, combined with the synoptic story. The Sibyl speaks of a "God extended on the cross."‡ "The Word Creator of forms" is described as suffering upon the earth, and the particulars of the passion are given as in the Synoptics.§ In two places, however, the piercing of the side of Jesus is mentioned (a circumstance in our Gospels peculiar to the fourth), but with a certain variation from the Johannean account.|| The diversity from the narrative in the fourth Gospel is observable in the following particulars: 1, the piercing or smiting is here before death and not after, for there supervene upon it the three hours' darkness and the rending of the temple veil; 2, the piercing does not appear to have taken place, according to the Sibyl, for the reason assigned in the Gospel, but to satisfy the law of the Jews; 3, it is said to have been done *καλάμῳ*, not *λόγχῃ*; and there seems on the whole to be a confusion between the account of the piercing the side with a spear after death, according to John xix. 34, and the smiting the head with a reed before crucifixion, in Matt. xxvii. 30, Mark xv. 19; and perhaps also with the giving the potion on a reed, which immediately precedes the earthquake in the two first Gospels. Hence it appears probable the incident was not derived from the fourth Gospel, but represents the growth of the tradition at an earlier stage, and before the *κάλαμος* of the original story, which was not a mortal weapon, had been transformed into

* Mr. James Donaldson doubts the genuineness of the fragment in which the words occur. See "A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine." London: 1866. Vol. III. pp. 244—247.

† See particularly Bk. v. in the edition of Alexandre, Paris, 1841; and Bk. xi. in Mai's *Scriptorum Vett. Nova Collectio*. Tom. III. Rome: 1828.

‡ Ὁ ξύλον ὧ μακαριστὸν ἐφ' ᾧ θεὸς ἐξετανόσθη.—vi. 26.

§ viii. 285 seq.

|| Καὶ στέφανον φορέσῃ τὸν ἀκάνθινον Ἡδὲ γε πλευρὰν νύξουσι καλάμοι-σιν.—i. 372, 373. Πλευρὰ τε νύξουσι καλάμῳ διὰ τὸν νόμον αὐτῶν.—viii. 296.

λόγῳ, which was, and the piercing with which would ensure or certify death. If a wound such as is described in the fourth Gospel had been known to the Sibylline writer, it is unaccountable that mention of it should have been omitted among the other features of the passion. For neither is its infliction on the cross described, nor the scar of it in the risen body of the Saviour; although he is represented as manifesting himself in the flesh after his resurrection as he was before, and shewing to his disciples the *four* wounds in his hands and feet, corresponding with the four kingdoms of the world combined in accomplishing his death.* On another subject we meet with a reference to the baptismal washing as instituted by the Lord after his resurrection, in which occurs the expression, "born from above."† It would, however, be unwarrantable to attribute every doctrine of the divine λόγος, or every allusion to baptismal regeneration in the second century, to the sole source of the fourth Gospel. So, again, such an expression as "He who believeth on him shall have eternal life,"‡ may have been a common Christian phrase. And on the whole we find nothing indicating the fourth Gospel as the actual channel through which the Sibylline writers derived even any doctrine, whereas concerning the events which are peculiar to that Gospel they are altogether silent.

We come now to Justin. If already there may be reason to suppose the fourth Gospel was known and acknowledged for apostolic at least in the Roman Church as far back as the year 150, our evidence should here be touched or overlapped by that of Justin. He wrote between the years 140 and 166, when he suffered martyrdom in the same year with Poly-

* Πρῶτα δὲ τοῖς ἰδίῳις φανερὰ τότε Κύριος ὁφθῆναι,
Σάρκινος, ὡς πάρος ἦν, χερσὶ τε ποσὶ τ' ἐπιδείξας
Τέσσαρα τοῖς ἰδίῳις ἰχνη πηχθέντα μέλεσσι
Ἀντολίην τε, δύσιν τε, μεσημβρίην τε, καὶ ἄρκτον.
Τόσαι γὰρ κόσμου βασιλῆϊδες ἐκτελέσουσι
Πρᾶξιν τὴν ἀθέμιστον ἐπίφογον εἰς τύπον ἡμῶν.
viii. 318-323.

† Καὶ τότε ἀπὸ φθιμένων ἀναλύσας, εἰς φῶς ἤξει,
Πρῶτος ἀναστάσεως κλητοῖς ἀρχὴν ὑποδείξας
Ἀθανάτου πηγῆς ἵνα λουσάμενοι ὑδάτεσσι
Τὰς πρότερον κακίας, ἀναγεννηθέντες ἄνωθεν,
Μηκέτι δουλεύωσιν ἀθέμοις ἤθεσι κόσμου.
viii. 313-317.

‡ Comp. viii. 255, with John iii. 36.

carp. We shall have to notice presently that Papias relied for the truth of the Gospel history on the living oral tradition, rather than upon written records. Justin, on the contrary, constrained to do so, partly at least, by the controversial necessity of shewing a tangible basis for the Christianity of which he undertook the defence, appeals in the most express manner to written memoirs. What the character of these "Memoirs" was, is not necessary to the present part of the inquiry to discuss; only, they were "apostolic," and they comprised "everything" concerning the Saviour Jesus Christ.* Thus, any narrative to which Justin does not refer seems to be absolutely excluded from claiming apostolic authority, as material for the life of Christ. It may be urged on the other side, as by Semisch, that the πάντα in the subjoined quotation ought not to be pressed; still it is an anterior question whether among the ἀπομνημονεύσαντες Justin included the author of the fourth Gospel. Moreover, it does not seem very likely (whatever force may be given to the πάντα, relatively to tradition) that he would have used such an expression, if he had had before him a Gospel esteemed by him apostolic, in which it is said, "And there are many other things which Jesus did," &c. (John xxi. 24); or supposing the twenty-first chapter to be given up, as probably not having belonged to the original Gospel, this other passage, "And many other signs truly did Jesus," &c. (xx. 30).

The question, however, comes back to this, Does Justin refer to the fourth Gospel—either refer to it as John's, or refer to it at all? In the first place, as is well known, he cites or refers to no Gospel by name; and it may be said, there is no more reason he should refer by name to John than to any other evangelist. We, however, are in search of a positive proof; and it is no answer to say that he identifies John as much as he identifies Matthew, Mark or Luke, supposing his identification of them to be insufficient. And there is this—he refers to the "Memoirs" as a collective product; whereas, if the fourth Gospel is apostolic at all, it is—which we must bear in mind as an essential element in our present investigation—the work of the individual apostle "who leaned on the Lord's breast." There was nothing to restrain

*Ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶδαξαν.—Apol. i. c. 33. ed. Otto. vol. i. p. 208.

Justin from referring to John personally as author of the Gospel; quite the contrary. For he does refer to the apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse in support of his own millenarian opinions.* Why should he not likewise refer to him by name if he had supposed him also to be the author of the fourth Gospel, in support of statement either of doctrine or of fact? It is true the facts in the life of Jesus especially dwelt upon by Justin—the accounts of the infancy, the baptism, the temptation—are not touched on in the fourth Gospel. The apologist therefore, it may be said, had no occasion to refer to it. But this is the very thing so inconceivable, that Justin should have deemed none of the events peculiar to the fourth Gospel, such as the raising of Lazarus or the miracle in Cana of Galilee, to have been worthy of citation, if the Gospel was really before him. Again, Justin read in his Gospel some things at least which differ from the narrative in the fourth Gospel, as that Jesus was apprehended and crucified on the Passover.† He also characterizes the discourses of Christ as “short and concise,” and illustrates that statement at length by instances from the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere—not, of course, from the fourth Gospel, in which most of the discourses, particularly the leave-taking, are anything but concise.‡

But there is another very convincing proof that Justin either did not know the fourth Gospel, because as yet it was not generally known, or, knowing it, avoided referring to it, as not being of apostolic authority; and that is derived from the stress which he himself laid on his doctrine of the “Logos.” He urged that doctrine both against Jews and heathen; and it is inconceivable that in so doing he should not have appealed to the fourth Gospel, had he esteemed it the work of an apostle—if not as an authority with his adversaries, at least as an evidence of the Christian tenet. It is true that his “Logos” doctrine by no means coincides

* Καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ τις ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη ποιήσῃ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοῦτε τῷ ἡμετέρῳ Χριστῷ πιστεύσαντας προεφήτευσεν.—Dial. c. Tryph. c. 81. Otto, ii. p. 278.

† Καὶ ὅτε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ πάσχα συνελάβετε αὐτὸν καὶ ὁμοίως ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐσταυρώσατε γέγραπται.—Dial. c. Tryph. c. 111. Otto, ii. p. 370.

‡ Βραχεῖς δὲ καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγονόασιν· οὐ γὰρ σοφιστὴς ὑπῆρχεν ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν.—Apol. i. c. 14. Otto, i. p. 166.

with that of the first chapter in the fourth Gospel ; and it is not necessary now to define their points of difference. But in Justin's own mind it must have been either similar to it or different ; if similar, he would have referred in corroboration of his own doctrine to the Gospel of an apostle, had such existed ; if different, he must have esteemed the Gospel, though extant, not to have been the work of an apostle, and to be without authority, therefore he did not refer to it. Justin is indeed sometimes spoken of in a loose way as a disciple of John's,* upon the mere assumption, we suppose, that he could have derived his doctrine of the divine reason from no other source but the fourth Gospel. But such an assumption is altogether baseless. In fact, with Justin the "Son of God," or "second God,"† receives the title λόγος along with other appellations: "sometimes he is called glory, sometimes wisdom, sometimes angel, sometimes God, sometimes Lord and Word."‡ And, singularly enough for our present purpose, when he refers to the memoirs of the apostles as the Christian authority for understanding Christ to be Son of God, and to have proceeded from the Father before all created things, he does not apply to him the appellation of "Word," though he does recite many other appellations, whereby he supposed the prophets to have foreshadowed him.§ Whether the expressions of Justin are all of them reducible to a consistent system is not of importance to our present inquiry—undoubtedly towards his Jewish antagonists he prefers to identify Christ the Son of God with the angel who in ancient days from time to time was manifested to the Fathers ; towards the heathen, with the Divine Reason which energized in prophets and in good men of all ages and nations. But in this latter connection he does not quote the texts from the fourth Gospel which would

* "Though a disciple of John he remembers Plato." Merivale's *Conversion of the Northern Nations*, p. 11. 1866.

† "Ὅτι ἐστὶ καὶ λέγεσθαι Θεὸς καὶ κύριος ἕτερος ὑπὸ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων δε καὶ ἄγγελος καλεῖται.—Dial. c. 56. Otto, ii. 178.

‡ Dial. c. 61.

§ Καὶ υἱὸν θεοῦ γεγραμμένον αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες καὶ υἱὸν αὐτὸν λέγοντες γενοήκαμεν ὄντα καὶ πρὸ πάντων ποιημάτων ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δυνάμει αὐτοῦ καὶ βουλῇ προσελθόντα δε καὶ σοφία, καὶ ἡμέρα, καὶ ἀνατολή, καὶ μάχαιρα, καὶ λίθος, καὶ ῥάβδος, καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ, κατ' ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον τρόπον, ἐν τοῖς τῶν προφητῶν λόγοις προσαγορεύεται.—Dial. c. 100.

have been so much to his purpose, "That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (i. 9), and "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become sons of God" (i. 12), although according to him all who have lived in obedience to the Divine Reason have been Christians.* The more rare scriptural expressions applied by him to Jesus Christ are accounted for without the necessity of supposing they must have been derived from the fourth Gospel, as "first-born" in the last cited passage would come from the eighty-ninth Psalm; and in the only place in which he calls Christ "only begotten," which sounds at first as if he must have taken the appellation from John i. 14, 18, he has been citing Psalm xxii. 19—21, as prophetic of Christ, where that term occurs at ver. 20. So he calls Christ "the holy light sent unto men from God,"† suggested not by John i. 9, but Isaiah v. 20, "Woe unto them that put darkness for light, and light for darkness;" and when he terms baptism the "water of life"‡ it is not in allusion to John iv. 14, vii. 38, but to Isaiah, who he says prophesied of baptism (xxxv. 6, 7), and to Jeremiah, whose text he there quotes concerning "the broken cisterns that can hold no water" (ii. 13). That in Justin and in the fourth Gospel should be found similar expressions founded on, and in most cases in Justin evidently from their context suggested by, phrases in the Old Testament, cannot surprise us.

There is, however, one passage which requires further examination. He is describing the ceremony of Christian baptism—"They are led by us," he says, "where there is water, and are re-born after the manner in which we ourselves have been re-born, for in the name of the Father of all and Lord God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, they then make their bath in the water. For Christ also said, 'Unless ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"§ The

* Τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτοτόκον τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι ἐκδιδάχθημεν καὶ προσημύσαμεν λόγον ὅντα οὐ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε. Καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι καὶ ἄθεοι ἐνομισθήσαν.—Apol. i. c. 16. For πρωτοτόκος compare Ps. lxxxix. 27.

† Dial. 17.

‡ Ὑδωρ τῆς ζωῆς.—Dial. c. 14.

§ Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν Ἄν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τοκουσῶν τοῦτε ἀπαξ γεννημένοις ἐμβῆναι, φανερόν πᾶσιν ἐστὶ.—Apol. i. c. 61.

question of course is, whether this passage contains a reference to the text, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," &c.* In the first place, Justin does not state whether he derived this saying of Christ from written history or tradition; he refers to no "Memoir," and it is very possible that Christ having used some such words, Justin and the author of the fourth Gospel may have drawn from the same tradition. Secondly, that Justin did not derive his passage from the fourth Gospel is probable, because he omits the solemn address, "Verily, verily," &c.; the indefinite singular in the Gospel is plural in Justin; the "not able to see," "not able to enter" in the Gospel, is "shall not enter," in Justin; and "kingdom of God" in the former, is "kingdom of heaven" in the latter; moreover, "born from above" in the Gospel, is "re-born" in Justin. And on the whole, the words attributed to Jesus may be nothing more than a modification of the saying in the first Gospel, "Verily, I say unto you, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xviii. 3), at a time when the baptismal ceremony was already in process of development into a sacrament. Thus Justin and the author of the fourth Gospel would stand on the same level, but neither of the parallel passages, now referred to, be derived from the other.

It is certainly not without significance that Justin here employs the phrase, "kingdom of heaven," in accordance with the first Gospel, and in consistency with his own millenarianism, a phrase which is never met with in the fourth Gospel, and which would indeed be alien from the conception of the spiritual birth from above which is the essential idea in the passage from it now under consideration. And on the whole, the similarities to be met with in Justin to the fourth Gospel, either in doctrine or expression, are naturally and easily explained upon the supposition of common or cognate sources—more naturally and easily than on the supposition of his having been in any sense "a disciple of John's." The eighth chapter of the book of Proverbs, the first and twenty-fourth chapters of Ecclesiasticus, the writ-

* Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.—John i. 3-5.

ings of Philo, sufficiently account for his doctrine of the λόγος, such as it is—his familiarity with the Old-Testament writings generally supplied language which resembles in some but in no great number of instances and with no very striking closeness the language of the fourth Gospel. At the same time, the nearer Justin is supposed to be brought to the author of the fourth Gospel, and the more determined we are to assume a relation between them, the more difficult does it become to account for the silence of Justin as to things insisted on or narrated in the fourth Gospel, except on the supposition of a deliberate avoidance, hardly separable from contempt, certainly inconsistent with the recognition of an apostolic authorship. So far from testifying, however indirectly, to the authorship of the fourth Gospel by a companion of the Lord, if Justin knew it, he purposely ignored it and passed it by.

Polycarp, it will be remembered, is alleged by those who maintain the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, as the one only necessary link between Irenæus and the apostle John. Irenæus, it is said, could not have received the fourth Gospel as John's, unless Polycarp, the disciple of John, who must have known the facts, had so informed him. All that is extant of Polycarp's is his Epistle to the Philippians, mentioned by Irenæus as "very useful, and from which the character of his faith and his preaching of the truth" might be learnt.* It could hardly be expected there should be anything about the Gospel, as there is not, in so short an Epistle. There is not even any mention of John; while the "blessed Paul" is praised for his wisdom, and his Epistles are recommended. We are also in an entirely different atmosphere of thought from that of the fourth Gospel, or of Justin; nor is there any Logos doctrine.

But so far from Polycarp serving as an external witness to the genuineness of the Gospel, because he *must* have told Irenæus so, there is the strongest possible ground for saying that he could not possibly have regarded the Gospel as the work of the apostle, supposing it to have been known to him. The Asiatic Christians were accustomed to celebrate their passover, in commemoration of the institution of the Lord's Supper and subsequent death of the

* Iren. III. iii. 4.

Redeemer, on the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month, at the same time when the Jews ate their Paschal lamb;* they thus broke in upon the fast of the Great Week, a thing which was deemed irreligious by the rest of the Christians in Europe and Africa, who on that account did not celebrate their Paschal Supper till the night immediately preceding the anniversary of the Resurrection. The Roman Christians alleged for this latter practice the authority of St. Peter and St. Paul; the Asiatic Christians for theirs, that of the apostles Philip and John. With other points of dissension which flowed from this difference we have no concern, and have only to fix our attention upon this circumstance—the case of the Asiatic Christians was entirely founded upon the facts, that the “Last Supper” celebrated by Jesus was the Paschal Supper of the Jews, and that the practice of observing for the Christian Supper the same day with the Jews was “in accordance with the Gospel” and with the practice, among others, of St. John. Accordingly, Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, in his Letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, of which part is preserved in Eusebius,† contended that the proper day for celebration must be the same with that on which it appears from the Gospel Christ celebrated his Supper with his disciples, which was on the fourteenth day of the month. In this Letter Polycrates alleges also the example of Polycarp, and relates that when Polycarp himself went to Rome in the time of Anicetus (152—162), they discussed this among other differences; but Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp not to observe the fourteenth day, “because he always had observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the apostles with whom he associated.” Now if anything is critically certain it is, that the “last Supper” described in the fourth Gospel was not the Paschal Supper of the Jews, but preceded it by a day.‡

* This Paschal Supper of the ante-Nicene period, it must be remembered, is not to be confounded with the Easter Feast; it was intended to be celebrated, not on the anniversary of the resurrection, but on the day of the passion. Mosheim's *Commentaries on the Affairs of the Christians*, Vidal's translation, Vol. II. pp. 370—384.

† E. H. lib. v. c. 24.

‡ M. de Pressensé candidly acknowledges the futility of the attempts to reconcile the Synoptic accounts and that of the fourth Gospel in this respect,

It is of no importance here to express any opinion as to which of the two accounts, the Synoptic or the Johannean, is the more probable in this particular; but for the question as to the genuineness of the fourth Gospel we have this result. If John observed his Paschal Supper on the fourteenth day of the month, as the early tradition so positively affirms that he did, he cannot have been the author of the fourth Gospel, which gives an account of its institution on the thirteenth; and if Polycarp, with whose evidence we are now concerned, knew that John had been accustomed so to observe it on the fourteenth, he could not have received as John's a writing inconsistent on that point both with the other Gospels and with the apostle's own practice.

It is not necessary for us to entangle ourselves in the thorny paths of the Ignatian controversy, which concerns a totally different subject, and we are disposed to acknowledge with Baur that the difference between the three Epistles to the Romans, Ephesians and Polycarp, and the four to the Trallians, Philadelphians, Smyrnæans and Magnesians, as well as their longer and shorter recensions, differ rather in quantity than in quality. Which of the Epistles, if any, belonged in fact to Ignatius, and in what form, and what date could really be assigned to them, would be only of importance here, if there appeared in them any such evidence, *primâ facie*, as that of which we are in search. But there is nothing of the kind. The name of John is not once mentioned in these Epistles (although Peter and Paul are referred to as apostles and superior to Ignatius himself), which would be strange, had the author of the Epistles been really a disciple and intimate of St. John. It is not of course at all strange if the Epistles were in fact concocted in Rome; but we have not to deal with that hypothesis. There is not only in these Epistles no citation of John under that name, but no citation, under any form, of words to be found in the fourth

and gives the preference to the latter. He says, "Nous avons déjà établi le désaccord sur ce point entre les Synoptiques et Saint Jean. Aucun des moyens proposés pour concilier les deux récits ne nous paraît satisfaisant." And then, "En résumé, nous regardons jusqu'ici la contradiction comme insoluble tout en donnant entièrement raison au récit de Saint Jean." (Jesus-Christ, &c., pp. 592, 593.) So Lücke, who defends the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, conceived a rectification of the Synoptics to be here supplied by it. (Commentar über d. Ev. d. Joh. Tom. II. pp. 314—334.)

Gospel; and there are only a very few passages which present any similarity to some which may be met with in it. We read of "God becoming incarnate."* Satan is called "the ruler of this world;"† "water living and speaking in me," has only a remote resemblance to John iv. 13, vii. 38; again, "the heavenly bread, the bread of life which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God,"‡ is not a citation of John vi. 35, though it expresses the same mystic idea and may have a sacramental reference. Also, in "the spirit which is from God is not deceived, for it knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth,"§ the thought is not the same as in the Gospel (iii. 8), nor the phrase either. In Ignatius, *πνεῦμα* is "spirit;" in the Gospel, "wind;" in Ignatius, "it knoweth whence it cometh," &c.; in the Gospel, "thou canst not tell whence it cometh;" it is an entirely different application to different arguments of a well-known illustration, of which neither writer can be supposed to have been the inventor. Once more, we read of "the Son of God, his eternal Word, not having gone forth from silence;"|| which, whether or not there is any polemical reference to the Valentinian *Σιγή*, has no particular resemblance to the phraseology used in John i. concerning the Divine Logos.

The first Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians is generally received as genuine. He is considered to have been contemporary with the apostles; he refers to Peter and Paul as already martyred; he makes not the slightest reference to John. The only two passages which have any resemblance to anything in the Gospel are to be found in the forty-second and forty-ninth chapters of the Epistle. In the former it is said that "Christ was sent from God, and the apostles from Christ;"¶ in the latter, that Christ gave "his blood and his flesh"—"his flesh for our flesh, and his life for our life."** In Clement there is no doctrine

* Ad Eph. c. 7.

† *Αἰῶνος τούτου*—ad Rom. 7; comp. John xvi. 11, *ἀρχὸν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* and 2 Cor. iv. 4, *Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*.

‡ Ad. Rom. 7.

§ Ad. Philadelph. 7; comp. John iii. 8.

|| *αὐτοῦ λόγος διδὸς οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθὼν*.—ad. Magn. 8.

¶ Comp. John xvii. 18; xx. 21.

** Comp. John vi. 51 ff., where the metaphor is much more harsh and elaborate; also xv. 13.

of λόγος whatsoever. In the second, but not generally received, Epistle there is met with the expression, "Jesus Christ the Lord, being at first spirit, became flesh,"* which is as much Pauline as Johannean. Any evidence from Clement, therefore, comes to nothing. Moreover, according to the received chronology he died in the third year of Trajan, A.D. 99, a year or two before the apostle John, and possibly before the publication of the Gospel, if he wrote it; so that any reference to him is beside the mark.

Thus there does not appear any extant external evidence at all approaching the supposed date of its composition, which can attach the fourth Gospel to the authorship of St. John. But there is a very weighty negative evidence which must be cast into the other scale. We read in Eusebius† the following citation from Irenæus: "These things are attested by Papias, who was John's hearer and the associate of Polycarp, an ancient writer who has mentioned them in the fourth book of his works; for he has written a work in five books." So that, according to Irenæus, Papias and Polycarp stood on the same level in descent from the apostles, and were both hearers of John. Eusebius himself then goes on: "So far Irenæus. But Papias himself, in the Preface to his discourses, by no means asserts that he was a hearer and an eye-witness of the holy apostles, but informs us that he received the doctrines of faith from their intimate friends." And, after quoting him, says: "Where, it is proper to observe, the name of John is twice mentioned. The former of which he mentions with Peter and James and Matthew and the other apostles, evidently meaning the evangelists. But in a separate point of his discourse, he ranks the other John with the rest not included in the number of apostles.....he distinguishes him plainly by the name of presbyter.....And the same Papias, of whom we now speak, professes to have received the declaration of the apostles from those that were in company with them, and says also that he was a hearer of Aristion and the presbyter John." It is impossible not to be struck with the parallelism between the account given by Irenæus of Papias as a hearer of John, meaning the apostle, thus shewn by Euse-

* ὡν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμα ἐγένετο σὰρξ. 2 Ep. c. 9.

† E. H. bk. iii. c. 9.

bius to be erroneous on the evidence of Papias himself, and the like account given by him of Polycarp in the Epistle to Florinus already quoted. In the former case, the means of a demonstrative rectification were before Eusebius; in the latter, they are absent. But even as the letter of Florinus stands, it is very doubtful whether the converse of Polycarp was not with the second John, who used to relate *his* converse with the rest who had seen the Lord; and so Polycarp received his accounts of the Lord's miracles and doctrine "from the eye-witnesses of the word of life," but not at first hand.* And so on the whole we cannot avoid the conviction that there must have been more than one link between the apostle John and Irenæus. But however this may be, Papias, though not a companion of the apostle John, was a companion of the second John, also of Ephesus; where the apostle is said to have published his Gospel; where his tomb was shewn; where, if anywhere, the truth concerning him would be known, and no such important work as the writing of a Gospel be suffered to fall into oblivion. Notwithstanding these associations, Papias makes no mention of any Gospel of John's, although he does mention, on the authority of John the presbyter, that Mark was the interpreter of Peter, and that Matthew wrote a Gospel in the Hebrew dialect; to which Eusebius, who culled carefully all the ancient testimonies concerning the authorship of the books of the New Testament, adds—"The same author, Papias, made use of testimonies from the First Epistle of John and likewise from that of Peter."† It is hardly possible for negative evidence to be stronger, that no Gospel of the apostle John was known to Papias or to the church at Ephesus.

It will remain for us, on some other occasion, to inquire whether the internal evidence derived from the writing itself is so cogent as to counterbalance this absence of all external proof; or whether, on the other hand, it will tend in the same direction, and turn a verdict of not proved into

* Καὶ τὴν μετὰ Ἰωάννου συναναστροφὴν, ὡς ἀπήγγελλε καὶ τὴν μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν ἐωρακότων τὸν Κύριον καὶ ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευε τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας ὡς παρὰ τῶν αὐτοπτῶν τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ λόγου παρεληφώς ὁ Πολύκαρπος ἀπήγγελλε πάντα σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς.—Irenæus, *Fragm. Ep. ad Florinum* ap. Jacobson, *PP. Apostolici*, i. p. lv.

† E. H. lib. iii. c. 39.

one of disproved. And there will remain beyond, the further inquiry, what effect on the credibility of the narrative itself the conclusions we shall have arrived at will necessitate or admit.

But if we seem to see, even at the present stage, the probability that we may no longer be able to rely on the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, and are fearful that thereby we shall be robbed of a most precious treasure—a little reflection will convince us that our loss, however we may at first lament it, will not be without its compensations. The controversial spirit is acknowledged to have been for ages the bane of Christendom. What will be the effect upon it of a conclusion that probably the fourth Gospel may not be apostolic? It will thereby be more effectually discouraged and abated than by a like conclusion concerning any other of the Biblical writings. Controversies which have raged, perhaps more furiously than any others, and which if re-awakened under the old conditions would undoubtedly so rage again, have been fed as with an unconsumable fuel from the assumption that in the fourth Gospel are to be read the words of an apostle, an undoubted umpire, filled with the divine afflatus, and decisive on this side or on that.

Words torn from contexts, forced and distorted constructions, irreconcilable and insoluble texts which can be made to square perfectly with no system, have been hurled from side to side, like rugged missiles and fiery darts winged from the bow of the "beloved disciple." But if, after all, the writing be not his, if the author cannot be shewn to have been even a hearer of the Lord Jesus, then these stony weapons and fiery darts will become mere *bruta fulmina*. We are now thinking only of the speculative or dogmatical portion of the Gospel. In respect to which, how flat would become all these verbal conflicts, and how they must of necessity die out! And, so far, the way would be prepared for a Christianity not built up on a supposed true conception of the superhuman in the person of Jesus Christ, not upon a presumed adequate knowledge of what he was, but on an endeavour to ascertain and carry into practice the religious principles which he taught.

S. T. B.

VI.—THE LIVING CHURCH THROUGH CHANGING CREEDS.

THE perpetual appearance of new questions and new dissensions in theology, and their dissolving effect upon the religious life of society, compel the inquiry, where the disintegration is to stop, and whether no residue is to be left of Catholic Unity amid our Protestant Variety. So long as the schools of thought alone determine the groups for worship, and nothing deeper than opinion brings Christian men together, the divisive process must continue, and new lots be cast for shreds of the seamless robe. It is not the critical faculty that holds even concurrent men together: it is for ever making new distinctions, and breaking into the seats of the old repose: and unless there be something to balance its restlessness, all durable and common piety is gone.

But the moment we set ourselves before the reality of God, and ask how we stand with him, we know that beneath his eye there is a "*Civitas Dei*,"—an assemblage of men meaning to be loyal to him, and owned by him as willing subjects of his righteousness. This, brought into a conscious community by Christ, is, in the view of the old divines, the *Christian Church*:—a thing therefore not made or mapped out by man, or at all disposable or definable by his will, but subsisting as a real Divine fact in the world; which it is ours simply to find and let be, adding nothing, and taking nothing away. The human fellowship, the human sympathies, are to follow the Divine, and flow freely across the lines of intellectual as of social distinction.

From this sublime conception, of a real society drawn towards God, it followed that nothing was to be made a condition of church union which he had not made a condition of acceptance. "What possible reason," it is asked, "can be given, why such things should not be sufficient for communion with a Church, which are sufficient for eternal salvation?"* Nathanael Oldfield (of Southwark, ob. 1696) "was not for other terms of Church communion than the terms of our common Christianity," and declared himself "of one Church with all those whom he hoped to meet in

* Occasional Papers (1716), I. x. p. 26, quoted from Stillingfleet.

heaven :”* and John Shower (of the Old Jewry), who preached his funeral sermon, maintained that “where serious piety and practical religion come to be most *valued* and to be *distinguishing*, nothing will be made a test or boundary to Christian communion but what is necessary to make a man a good Christian, render him acceptable to God, and carry him safe to the Heavenly Canaan.”† And in still broader terms does Samuel Bury, of Bury St. Edmund’s and afterwards of Lewin’s Mead, say in 1700, “Let religion itself, in its own latitude, be the common bond of all union.”‡

With their eye thus intently fixed on the heavenly conditions, it is no wonder that the elder Nonconformists religiously guarded their sanctuary from all doctrinal distinctions not inherent in the spiritual life ; and refused to press upon the Church beliefs which, in the school and in the world, they themselves held with strong conviction. That a tenet was true, that it was momentous, that it was logically inseparable from their conception of the Divine economy, was not enough to justify its ecclesiastical adoption. The only question was, “Did God require it? Was it needful, like the pure heart and the faithful will, in order to be at peace with him?” It is a common, but a mean, suspicion, that where there is doctrinal latitude, there is a secret need for it in doctrinal doubt. On the contrary, all Christian history shews that in all the deeper movements of spiritual life,—from the days of Tauler to those of the Quakers and the Quietists,—the hard lines of system melt and disappear without change of creed, and piety and love escape into unconscious catholicity. Not till the fervour has passed away, and the religion, losing the tension of prayer and labour, crystallizes into forms of thought, does rigour of belief assert itself, and substitute the dread of error for the enthusiasm of goodness.

It was then a Catholic heart, and not an undistinguishing intellect, in Baxter and his successors, which made them leave the theology of their societies open and indeterminate. God’s measure of comprehension was to be

* Shower’s Letter on the Character of N. Oldfield.

† Funeral Sermon for Dr. N. Grew, p. 20.

‡ Funeral Sermon for Fairfax, p. 88.

theirs ; and any condition superfluous to him was forbidden to them. Hence they persistently refused to accept for their societies any doctrinal or special name, however truly it might describe their personal opinions ; and regarded with aversion, as an intolerable egotism, the practice of defacing the sacred enclosure, which God had marked out in his own way, with the sign-boards and notices of human speculation. When, in 1691, Francis Tallents opened his new Meeting-house at Shrewsbury, "he caused it to be written on the walls, that it was built, not for a faction or party, but for the promotion of repentance and faith in communion with all that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."* This unconditional repudiation of distinctive names, and fixed resolve to keep theology open and religion large, is the ever-recurring characteristic of our predecessors after the Revolution. Dr. Calamy, before his dedication to the ministry in 1694, stipulates to be ordained "minister of the *Catholic Church of Christ*, without any confinement : " else he will break off the service in the midst and depart.† And, in 1709, preaching in Edinburgh from the text, "The disciples were called *Christians* first in Antioch," he "touched on the excellence and honourableness of that name ;" and "pressed such as knew its value to be *contented with it*, and carefully to answer it, without pretending to *make any addition*, by attempting which they *would in reality take from it*."‡

That this latitude was persisted in deliberately, in face of the demand,—inseparable from a state of society morbid with "*orthodoxies*,"—for more precision, is evident from the tone of its defenders. Moses Lowman anticipates the objection,—“If Christianity be a test sufficient, how shall we know how to rank and call men?”—and replies: “True, this has something in it indeed : were it come to this pass, we should be at a sad loss for *Shibboleths*, i.e. for party names and marks of distinction, and should be forced to share the name of Christian with all other pretenders to it:” “I cannot think it would be any just matter of lamentation.” And again, to the question, —

* Nonconformists' Memorial, Vol. II. p. 334.

† Calamy's Account of his own Life and Times, Vol. I. p. 342.

‡ Ibid. Vol. II. p. 179.

"Would you have *them* received as our fellow-christians who err in fundamentals?" he answers,—"I never yet could see a list of fundamentals in Christianity:"—"that only in my notion is a fundamental mistake in religion, which is inconsistent with a good heart and a religious conversation."* In the words of Dr. John Taylor upon this topic, words written in 1737, with evident presentiment of declining catholicity, there is something of prophetic solemnity: "If the Dissenters refuse all party schemes, and stand upon *the single basis of universal Christianity*"—"their cause shall stand, nor shall the gates of Hell prevail against it." "But if ever they abandon liberty and love, if they stiffly adhere to *party names and schemes*, if they set bounds to Scripture knowledge"—"they will become weak and waste, and dwindle into nothing."†

These Christians then regarded themselves as involuntary exiles from the commonwealth of the Church, driven out because they would not add to its terms of citizenship, and guarding its franchises till men should be content with their simplicity again. Excluded themselves, they would exclude no one, repel no one by a differential name, and let no door of the fold be shut which Christ had left open: If they were isolated and had to worship alone, it should be from no fault of theirs: they stood upon no specialty of their own, but upon the repudiation of all specialties as the condition of their corporate existence. They thought it bad argument to say, "Other people exclude us; so there is no harm in a name that excludes them:" and replied, "Then let the responsibility rest with them; and let us not be seduced by the narrowness of men into betraying the catholicity of God. If we retaliate on one 'party name' by taking its opposite, we make ourselves accomplices in schism, and meanly surrender to a fact against which,—though it should last as long as human littleness,—the Christian lives only to protest."

We may sum up the contents of this state of mind in the following three principles of ecclesiastical life:

- (1.) A basis of union as broad as Christianity.
- (2.) An unconditional refusal of special doctrinal names.

* Occasional Papers, II. i. pp. 23, 24.

† Defence of the Common Rights of Christians, p. 19.

(3.) An openness to progressive change: the Nonconformists, as Timothy Jollie (of Sheffield) said in 1703, "reserving to themselves a *liberty to reform, according to Scripture rule, in doctrine, discipline and worship.*"*

Under favour of this catholic constitution occurred that gradual theological change of private opinion from Trinitarian to Unitarian which characterized our history in the last century:—a change so perfectly legitimate that at no point of its course could there be the least excuse for arresting it, or for permitting the individuals who shared it to imprint upon their church its passing results to themselves. Not less, it is probable, than five-sixths of the chapels in which the worshipers are now Unitarian, have this broad foundation. Their walls have rung with the tones of successive theologies: beneath their pavement, or in their ground, lie the remains of faithful men dissentient in thought, but one in love, content to sleep, and hoping to wake, together. Nor is there anything to prevent such a church, as it lives on, becoming in its own history an epitome of Christian thought in its entire development; instead of taking the custody of detached truth, and forming, or deforming, itself by partial contemplations. And though it is chiefly *in succession* that it becomes the home of differing theologies, and enriches its life by sympathies beyond the present, yet, as the links of change are continuous, the varieties of belief must also learn to co-exist: and however logically impossible it may be for Trinitarian and Unitarian to worship together, it is certain that they practically did so in the mixed congregations of the transition period. In such mutual adjustments of piety and charity, as well as in pledges given to the past and the future for largeness of thought and sympathy, there is a moral discipline infinitely preferable to any neatness and rigour of intellectual consistency.

On the 18th April, 1774, was opened the first English *Unitarian Chapel*, in Essex Street, London: a completely new type of religious society, in which the doctrine was not a changeable attribute of the individual members, but (under the form of a prescribed Liturgy) was embodied in the constitution of the place itself. This was a change

* Funeral Sermon for Thomas Jollie (his father), p. 28.

pregnant with results. There were older congregations, all whose members were adherents to the Unitarian theology. But they had recently been otherwise, and no one thought of identifying the societies, as such, with the new belief more than with the old ; they had used, without any idea of *using-up*, their reserved liberty of reform. But here was a place of worship, not founded on the open principle of kindred Nonconformists, but tied up, in the defining method of the English Church, to a given doctrinal view of Christianity. The Trust Deed did much the same thing with the Reformed Liturgy, that the Act of Uniformity had done with the Unreformed.

There were many causes to render infectious this departure from the open principle. The metropolitan importance of the society and the eminence of its ministers ; the rising interest of the Unitarian controversy, and the natural heedlessness of each generation towards everything but its own work ; the generous disposition to assume an unpopular name ; and the penal laws against impugners of the doctrine of the Trinity, which banded Unitarians, as such, together in defence ;—all tended to make doctrine the point of honour, and to produce distaste for the old latitude, which, if it sheltered much tranquil piety, might often serve as a refuge for temporizing cowardice. The new zeal, eager to count up its forces, drew no fine distinctions between institutions and their personal occupants, but claimed everything as Unitarian which was not in Trinitarian hands : chapels of neutral foundation were put on the muster-roll of a “party scheme :” annual meetings of ministers, dating from præ-heretic times, forgot their history and re-named themselves from the doctrine of the hour : and even Manchester New College, guarded as it is from appropriation by any theology, was called, in the periodicals of the day, the “Unitarian Academy at York.”• The same earnestness assumed a more legitimate direction, in the establishment of several General Societies for the propagation of doctrine and defence of personal rights : in 1791, the “Unitarian Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and the Practice of Virtue by the Distribution of Books :” in 1806, the “Unitarian Fund for the Promotion of Unitarianism.”

• E.g. *Monthly Repository* for 1807, p. 114.

rianism by means of Popular Preaching:" in 1809, the "Christian Tract Society," which however kept clear of controversial divinity: and in 1819, the "Unitarian Association for the Protection of the Civil Rights of Unitarians." In spite of the repeal, in 1813, of the statutory penalties against impugners of the doctrine of the Trinity, Unitarians, as such, were still under special disabilities; and it was to rescue them from this exceptional position that the last of these Societies was formed. In 1824-5, they were all merged in the present "British and Foreign Unitarian Association," which took up and extended their work, and has varied it, with much administrative skill, to meet the changing exigencies of the time; but which, however liberal may be its management, is by its constitution absolutely tied down to the interests of a special theology—"the promotion of the principles of Unitarian Christianity."

That this limited object is perfectly legitimate for all individual persons who hold Unitarian opinions, and for societies of Unitarian constitution; that the means by which it is pursued are good; that the name, "*Unitarian*," by which it is defined is exact, and should be freely taken by anti-Trinitarians to designate their personal belief,—is admitted on all hands. But it is a serious question whether, by force of circumstances, the Association, in the absence of any more comprehensive body, is not driven beyond its proper function as a doctrinal instrument, and does not step into the place of representative organ for congregations pledged by their history to keep clear, in their corporate capacity, of doctrinal names and limitations.

If it *does* aim at representing the old congregations, it necessarily *misrepresents* them: for its duty is to a special scheme; theirs to a Catholic latitude.

If it does *not* aim at representing them, then they remain *unrepresented*: and they cannot be reproached, if they wake to their position, and claim their work.

The actual state of things oscillates uneasily between these two hypotheses: the Association, according to the immediate exigency, now withdrawing, and then advancing, a representative pretension. When, in 1834, a central office was required for defence of the old foundations against orthodox suits, it was impossible to send into court an Agent, with a doctrinal name upon his forehead, to plead that

the trusts had devolved upon him in virtue of their doctrinal neutrality: and the Association, sensible of its incompetency, retreated into the background, and created, in its own Committee-room, a new "*Presbyterian*" Society to do the work of the threatened churches: and in the report of the first annual meeting in 1835, the ingenuous confession is made: "It was apparent that great ignorance existed among the Dissenters themselves as to the nature, principles and objects of the old Presbyterian foundations." The retiring disposition enforced by a moment of danger cannot however be expected to last for ever: and in quiet times there is an inevitable tendency in the Association to resume and press a representative function, and, in default of any other organ, to have that function accepted. It would be a deplorable thing that, even with their eyes open and of deliberate choice, a body of Nonconformist congregations with a broad inheritance should use their latitude merely to restrict it, and spend their liberty in tying their own hands and their successors. But it would be still more deplorable that, without intending to change their position, they should unconsciously drift, by the solicitation of a constant current, from their ample moorings into the very creeks and shallows they purposed to avoid. The Rules of the Association provide for a system of congregational representation: and the Circulars which, year by year, urge, upon old and new societies alike, the sending of deputies to its meetings, cannot fail, in the long run, to draw the less resisting masses within its attraction, till the centre of gravity is changed from Christian catholicity to doctrinal uniformity.

Who can contemplate without humiliation such surrender of a noble inheritance?—an inheritance so fruitful in adaptations to the present time, that every church around us is in strife and pining for the want of it. Intellectually, we can spare no latitude in any direction: on the one hand, a mystic leaning to some belief of Incarnation and of the permanent union of Christ with our humanity; on the other, a freer reading of the early history of Christianity; demand more than ever that no path of thought, no promise of light, be closed. Spiritually, we need,—were it only to tranquilize and balance the mere speculative susceptibilities,—some diversion from doctrinal interests into the large refreshing fields of piety and charity. Morally, we are bound

to be content with the present as a stage for our personal opinions, and not to bespeak for them the church of the future. For all these needs and obligations we have unexampled provision by historical descent and in actual possession. But, to make it operative, we must not shut ourselves up with institutions and ideas which reflect only the character of one or two generations, but live in the light of our whole history, and guard what is pure in the genius of it all. From its early time, the broad Church-basis; from its latter, the clear strong voice of individual conviction;—with these, combined but unconfounded, distinct yet not dissentient, opportunities are open to us of Christian service, impossible to the more embarrassed machinery of other churches.

To meet the duties of our age and place, no greater sacrifices are required than must always be needed, from time to time, in order to adjust the creations of the past to the life of the present. Were it practicable to transform the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, by change of constitution and of name, into an organ of free and catholic Christianity,—or, what is the same thing, to dissolve it by vote and then replace it by a more comprehensive organization,—this would doubtless be the simplest and heartiest procedure. But it is pronounced legally impossible to alter either its objects or its name, as defined in its first and second Rule: in conformity with which the property bequeathed to it must be still administered. The eminent lawyer by whose hand its Rules were drawn had himself discovered, ere the Association was fourteen years old, the need and the impracticableness of so radical a change. “I have long considered” (said Mr. Edgar Taylor in 1838) “the Unitarian Association to require altogether re-casting, if it be considered desirable to attempt to make it the general representation of our body, which its origin never aimed at.” “I however very much doubt whether it is the least prudent or desirable to make any such use of the old Association. It is not very likely that the members will ever agree to alter it to the extent wanted: and its *Name* and associations would render it difficult to make it of use; especially when we consider that a very large proportion of our body never have had anything to do with it, and many think it always did harm. I know more than one of its first

formers and most active supporters, who now think they were wrong from the beginning: but it would be far more wrong to insist on endeavouring to make an Institution of this sort the representation of the body itself. The polemic name is in itself a disadvantage and a restraint, a preliminary repulsion to many of our friends, and a note of offence and attack to the rest of the world." We must have, he adds, "some far better rallying-point and machinery for general union, on principles far wider than the propagation of Unitarianism as a creed; with a *Name* which, as a *neutral* one (merely descriptive and not theological) would remove the antagonistic and offensive character of a body named from a dogma;" "leaving direct proselytism to the Association (if kept up), or to any special Society taking up such objects." "I really think," he says, "something of this sort the only effectual and creditable way of getting us out of our difficulties, and that it furnishes the only chance of escaping disunion and ruin."

The writer of this strong opinion had been Solicitor to the Association from the first: and only in the preceding June had its members declared that "*in common with all the English Presbyterian Dissenters*, they owed a great debt of gratitude to him for his sagacious and masterly advice and assistance in various important cases affecting the rights and liberties of Dissenters generally, and particularly of the English Presbyterians, and *that branch of them* especially connected with this Association."* It will be observed that this Resolution plainly admits, what ought never to be denied or forgotten, that it is only a "*branch*" of our body which the Association represents; so that for the remainder, and for the whole, no organ exists.

This want it is time to supply, and in the way which Mr. Edgar Taylor suggested; i.e. by forming a Union on principles broad enough to cover the whole area of the liberal Christian churches, old or new; and leaving the Association to its own chosen work, of promoting a particular form of Christian doctrine, and administering the funds which have been bequeathed for that purpose. To keep, however, the two organizations distinct in their functions, and give a field to each, it is indispensable that the Unitarian Associ-

ation should vacate any pretension or attempt to represent *congregations*:—an attempt which, if made at all, it is practically impossible to confine to the few societies which have a doctrinal Trust-deed, and which is purely hurtful beyond. To rescind the rule for congregational representation would fortunately have no appreciable effect on any existing interest or usage. There are only six congregations that, at present, qualify themselves by subscription to send deputies; and, in order to continue themselves upon the list just as they are, the persons interested have only to resolve themselves into a District Association, and to qualify in that capacity. As however all these subscriptions come from congregations of the old foundation, they are themselves examples of an extension of the Association's representative function beyond desirable limits, and of its tendency to draw into the doctrinal stream what was launched to sail in more open and tranquil waters. It is earnestly to be hoped that the members of the Association will unreluctantly consent to part with a Rule so insignificant in its actual application and so questionable in its character and indirect effect. The ground will then be fairly open for a truly comprehensive organization, to be raised in common by those within and those without the Association, who, drop what they may from the mere opinions of the past, still find in the catholic traditions of the oldest Nonconformity the fittest spirit for the work of the newest. The construction, the offices, the name, of such a Union should be the object of careful deliberation; and be referred, for that purpose, to a Committee appointed at a General Meeting, and representing the varieties of tendency which have to be brought to concurrent action. In spite of what Mr. Edgar Taylor called "our discordant elements and our want of discipline," experience justifies the hope that, where a direction is given to our activity continuous with our history and concurrent with the spirit of the time, the "discords" will cease, and the "discipline" become superfluous, from the native authority of good sense, and the spontaneous return of harmony.

JAMES MARTINEAU.

VII.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE reader of Mr. Merivale's second course of Boyle Lectures* will scarcely fail to have his attention arrested by the following sentence from the Preface: "It is well to hold fast the assurance of the continuity of God's providence in the spiritual guidance of our species; to be convinced that, as we can discover no entirely new creation in the progress of natural things since the first beginnings we can trace of them, so neither has there been any entirely new moral or religious revelation vouchsafed to us." The words shew how thoroughly the writer is in sympathy with that wide view of the providential government of the world which regards Christianity as standing in a true historical relationship with the whole past history of mankind, with the best culture of the heathens as well as with the growth of the Hebrew religion. "Our religion," the writer goes on to say, "is an historical one: it is the history of religious progress. The Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament testify to a progressive development of Divine Truth. The verities imparted to the patriarchs are still the foundation of the religion of Jesus Christ; and the religious notions of the heathens, which seem to be themselves corruptions of the verities imparted to the patriarchs, or dim reflections of that Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, may well deserve to be regarded with interest, to be criticised with love and even with reverence." After this, one is scarcely prepared for even the moderate evangelicism of the Lectures that follow; for if the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation are not deserving of the name of a *new* religious revelation, supposing them to be revelation at all, it is not easy to conceive to what the term could be applied. Mr. Merivale is no doubt convinced that these doctrines are scriptural, and this conviction has prevented him from bringing out with sufficient clearness how completely they were a development of ideas which were far more heathen than Jewish. Yet he is too candid to conceal the fact that the orthodoxy of the early Fathers is very questionable. His view seems to be, that in the contest

* The Conversion of the Northern Nations. The Boyle Lectures for the Year 1865. By Charles Merivale, B.D. London: Longmans. 1866.

of the Christian monotheism against the idolatry of the heathens, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity were for a considerable time kept in abeyance. And were the doctrines in question clearly referable to Christ and his apostles, much might be said for this view. As the case stands, however, there cannot well be a doubt that the theology of the fourth century was simply the result of a gradual development of thought, and was as remote as possible from the teaching of Jesus Christ. Apart from this fault, we need scarcely say these Lectures are, like those of last year, to which they form a sequel, highly scholarly and instructive. The first four, which do not properly answer to the title of the work, are not the least interesting. The fifth Lecture is on the "Preparation of the Northern Nations for the Reception of Christianity," and the remaining three on "The Conversion of the Northern Nations," "The Northern Sense of Personal Relation to God," and "The Northern Sense of Male and Female Equality." In all of them the reader will find food for reflection, while he will be carried on by a style which, though less finished than that of the author's great historical work, is better adapted for spoken address.

M. de Pressensé's *Life of Christ*,* the work of a distinguished orthodox theologian of mild temper and large culture, displays the same kind of involuntary but honourable tribute to the potency of the purely critical and rationalistic biographers which the allopathists pay to the homœopathists. The old orthodox doctors, theological and medical, disown respectively the modern faculties; nevertheless, the stringency of their own rules is relaxed and their practice altered. In the one case we have less of the physic than the physical tastes abominate; in the other, we have milder preparations of the doctrines that the spiritual instincts reject. In his Preface the author freely admits that biographers like Rénan have made it necessary that Lives of Jesus should no longer be written in the interests of Dogma, unless the writers are prepared to see the whole human interest of Christianity pass out of their hands. The work is a sort of bird's-eye view of the history of Jesus, and of its religious

* *Jesus-Christ : Son Temps, Sa Vie, Son Œuvre.* Par E. De Pressensé. Pp. 684. Paris. 1866.

English Translation : *Jesus Christ, his Times, Life and Work.* London : Jackson, Walford and Hodder. 1866.

antecedents, Heathen and Jewish. The preliminary discussions, historical and critical, occupy considerably more than one-third of the volume. The learning is always adequate; the religious feeling tender, gentle and pure; the human appreciation of Christ, not powerful enough to add one new trait to the delineation, yet full of beautiful sensibility; the critical temper fair and candid, with no unscholarly struggles against necessary concessions. The result is a mildly orthodox view of the work and life of Christ, of great limpidity and of no force. We have not found one new touch to the portraiture of Christ, one fresh contribution towards the settlement of any vexed question. Every doctrinal harshness is humanized and softened: the rough places are made smooth. The whole strikes us, chiefly, as the most remarkable acknowledgment which Orthodoxy, learned and spiritual, has yet made to the power of the modern Criticism.—The English translation, the work of a lady, has been made from the proof-sheets of the original, and issued simultaneously with it. It is, on the whole, faithful and idiomatic. Should it reach a second edition, the foot-notes, and especially the references which they contain, might be much improved by the revision of a competent scholar.

Mr. Desprez's learned and judicious work on Daniel* is preceded by a long and most interesting introduction by Dr. Rowland Williams, which, partly anticipating the arguments of the book itself, partly expatiating over a wide range of kindred subjects, is everywhere distinguished both by lucidity of thought and vigour of style. We have lately devoted so large a portion of our space to the controversies which gather round the book of Daniel, as to make it inexpedient to follow Mr. Desprez through the details of his clear and convincing argument. His conclusions, which substantially agree with those arrived at in the articles referred to, may be briefly stated in his own words (p. 29):

“To recapitulate—1. The diversity of languages in which the book is written; 2. The place it occupies in the Hebrew Canon; 3. The use of Greek words; 4. The style of the book differing

* Daniel, or the Apocalypse of the Old Testament. By Philip S. Desprez, B.D., Incumbent of Alvediston, Wilts; with an Introduction by Rowland Williams, D.D. Williams and Norgate. 1865.

from the writings of the captivity ; 5. The historical character of the book extending to, but not beyond, the age of Antiochus Epiphanes ; 6. The seemingly marvellous narrations and historical inaccuracies which have aroused suspicion from the earliest times ;—are so many distinct and strong reasons for affixing a date later than that usually assigned to the book of Daniel It may not perhaps be unreasonable to infer that it is partly a compilation and re-arrangement of more ancient annals, and partly the original composition of some learned and pious Jew, who lived at a period subsequent to the scenes it describes—probably whilst his countrymen were still engaged in their patriotic struggle against Demetrius, and following up the advantages they had won from Antiochus Epiphanes. At this juncture, when the issue of the contest hung doubtful in the balance, the writer of this remarkable book throws the weight of prophetic influence into the scale, and by recounting the heroic endurance of the sainted martyrs of their race, oracularly animates the holy people to perseverance in the strife. With this view he avails himself of the prestige of a character celebrated in Jewish story, and enunciates his historico-prophetic visions under the name and authority of Daniel.”

Mr. Desprez's book, both in the moderation of its tone and the scientific character of its procedure, contrasts most favourably with Dr. Pusey's unhappy work on the same subject, which nevertheless is being rapidly bought by students of orthodox theology—an evil omen for the prospects of sound Biblical criticism in England ! We observe with pleasure that Mr. Desprez is about to publish a similar work on “John, or the Apocalypse of the New Testament,” and shall await its issue with interest.

It would be impossible within the compass of a brief notice to give any adequate idea of Dr. Bushnell's work on the *Vicarious Sacrifice*.* It is a most interesting and valuable contribution to theological science, and will probably be read and exert a healthy influence in quarters where the productions of more heretical pens would find but little favour. The writer will hold no terms with the theory that Christ's death was a penal satisfaction of God's outraged justice, and powerfully supports the moral view of the doctrine of atonement. He maintains that whatever vicarious-

* The *Vicarious Sacrifice* grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation. By Horace Bushnell, D.D. London : Alexander Strahan ; and Sampson Low, Son, and Marston. 1866.

ness existed in Christ's sacrifice belongs eternally to the nature of love, which takes upon its own sympathies the woes and sins of others. He has not, however, convinced us that "*vicarious sacrifice*" is a suitable designation for the idea which he intends to express. The word "vicarious" certainly implies, as he fully admits, a substitution, "indicating that one person comes in place, somehow, of another." But in the sorrow which a loving soul feels for another's sin there is no such substitution. The grief which Christ felt on account of sins not his own, his yearning compassion towards the sinner, were feelings peculiar to love; and he did not endure as a substitute the feelings proper to the sinner. Christ's soul was troubled, but he had neither penitence nor remorse; and we think the title, "the self-sacrifice of love," would express this view of his sacrifice in a way more attractive to the heart and more satisfying to the intellect than the title which Dr. Bushnell has chosen. However, the idea is worked out with such clearness and force, that we are not inclined to quarrel with the writer because he chooses to retain an accepted name, with which he has doubtless many interesting associations that have never been possessed by ourselves. The main thought of the book has long been dear to us; and a tinge of orthodox colouring may render it acceptable to many who wish for a richer, more rational and more elevating theology, without suffering the penalties of excommunication. The volume will also be valuable to many Unitarian readers, who, while completely rejecting the ordinary doctrine of atonement, have yet not succeeded in bringing their own thoughts and feelings on the subject into a definite form. We cordially recommend it to all who wish for an earnest, independent and profound exposition of a great subject.

Under the title, "Christ, the Light of the World,"* the Vicar of Doncaster publishes a volume of sermons, which, if report speak truly, have already seen the light in the pages of "Good Words." We do not say that they ought never to have been preached; for they are earnest in tone, clear and lively in style, sometimes even rising to a genuine eloquence of appeal; and many spoken words, which are

* Christ, the Light of the World. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D. London: Strahan. 1866.

hardly worthy of deliberate preservation, do a good work as they fall from the speaker's lips. But these sermons have nothing in them to justify their being printed, still less to warrant their being reprinted. While they do not possess any signal merit as religious exhortations, they are painfully unsatisfactory on the theological side. Science, to all appearance, does not exist for Dr. Vaughan. He takes all Biblical narratives, including those of the Fall and the Flood, in their barest and most literal sense. He deprecates all investigation of them, except for purposes of edification. His allusions to them convey the impression that he is perfectly aware of the existence of difficulties in regard to their origin and doctrinal value, but that he wilfully closes his own eyes, and tries his best to blind his hearers too. Dr. Vaughan is an accomplished scholar, a fair preacher, an industrious and successful parish priest; but since we have read this little volume, we have learned to acquiesce cheerfully in the *Nolo Episcopari* which exchanged the Bishopric of Rochester for the Vicarage of Doncaster.

Of much higher value is another volume of Sermons, issued by the same publisher, Mr. Plumptre's "Theology and Life."* Their author, who is Professor of Divinity at King's College, London, and well known as a poet no less than as a theologian, was requested to print the first sermon of this series by the Bishop of London, at one of whose ordinations it was preached; and has taken advantage of the occasion to add others of similar import. Nearly all the sermons in the volume are "*conciones ad clerum*"—having been preached either at King's College, on occasion of what seems to be an annual clerical festival, or at various ordinations, or before the University of Oxford. It is long since we have read a volume of discourses which maintain so high a level of thought, feeling and expression. Mr. Plumptre is one of those happy preachers who possess the power—only too rare—of passing by the conventionalities of pulpit exhortation, and going straight to the heart of his subject. His voice is that of a thoughtful, accomplished, liberal, devout man. The reader cannot but acknowledge that when he touches upon the controversies of the day, or leaves them

* *Theology and Life*: Sermons chiefly on Special Occasions. By E. H. Plumptre, M.A., Prof. of Divinity and Chaplain, King's College, London, and Prebendary of St. Paul's. London: Strahan. 1866.

on one side to call to mind the duties and hopes which they may hide but cannot abrogate, he speaks out of "the integrity of his heart." If he attempts to take up a position of mediation and reconciliation between contending extremes, it is in no unworthy spirit of accommodation, but because such a position is to his mind and disposition natural and seemly. We only regret that we have not space to justify our commendation by extracts. The sermon selected for publication by Bishop Tait, "The Ministry of Great Cities," is, in especial, a noble and large-hearted exhortation to candidates for the Christian ministry, and one which Non-conformist students might study with as much advantage as the hearers to whom it was actually addressed. We lay down Mr. Plumptre's volume with regret, but not without the intention of frequent recurrence to its eloquent and suggestive pages.

"Discourses on Special Occasions"* is the title of a volume of sermons by Mr. R. W. Dale, the successor of Mr. J. Angell James in the ministry at Carr's-Lane chapel, Birmingham. Clear and vigorous in style, earnest and devout in spirit, these sermons would, we doubt not, produce a great and legitimate effect as they were first spoken and heard. But they are better to preach than to print. Those who listened to any of them may be glad to possess a memorial of an occasion on which their hearts were stirred; but they do not possess either novelty of thought or connectedness and completeness of subject to justify an appeal to the general public. At the same time, we distinctly admit that these sermons are the outcome of a ministry far above the average in intellectual and religious power. But if of making books, and especially books of sermons, "there is no end," the critic is bound to apply to "volumes of discourses" precisely the same tests as to any other class of literature; and especially to keep in view the fact, that what may admirably serve the purposes of spoken religious exhortation, may not be equally fitted to exercise a permanent literary influence. Perhaps the most interesting and valuable sermon in the volume is that on "Morality and Religion," in which the author expounds the words of Micah,

* Discourses delivered on Special Occasions. By R. W. Dale, M.A. London: Jackson, Walford and Hodder. 1866.

"What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" in a way which he admits to be contradictory of the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession alike.

Dr. Guthrie's little volume, entitled "*The Angels' Song*,"* consists of reflections on the song ascribed to the angels who announced the birth of Christ to the shepherds of Bethlehem. There are some things in it at which sharp-eyed critics and theologians would stand aghast. But to those who have not yet sacrificed to criticism their simple and devout feelings, and can value the essence of a thought while they disagree with its form, it may prove interesting and suggestive. It is written in Dr. Guthrie's usual graceful style, and abounds in those short descriptive passages and those chaste illustrations in which he so greatly excels.

Among the pamphlets circulated by Mr. Thomas Scott, of Ramsgate, is one which deserves notice as a clear and very strong statement of the difficulties of the Gospel of the Infancy narrated by Matthew and Luke.† This is preceded by a long Preface, in which the writer insists with great earnestness upon the unhistorical character of the Acts of the Apostles, and the impossibility of reconciling its statements with those of the admittedly genuine Epistles of Paul. Looking upon the assertions and arguments of this pamphlet as engines of destruction directed against the doctrine of plenary inspiration, they are undeniably forcible. But in the interests of true and permanent historical criticism, it may be questioned whether the author does not at least appear to infer too much from the legendary character of what may be called the preludes to the first and third Gospels. Except as against ignorant bibliolaters, the critic has not now to do with individual witnesses, Matthew or Luke, and their personal credibility, but with a common substratum of evangelical tradition, which after an uncertain period, and by methods of which we know little, assumed the threefold form in which we now possess it. And the questions which most urgently demand an answer, and which are not negative but positive, are, how

* *The Angels' Song*. By Thomas Guthrie, D.D. London and New York: Alexander Strahan. 1866.

† *Credibility of the Gospel Narratives of the Birth and Infancy of Christ; with an Introduction on the Acts of the Apostles*. 1866.

far is this tradition credible? and by what process, if any, is it possible to winnow the wheat from the chaff? To infer the general incredibility of the Gospels from the impossibility of harmonizing the first chapters of Matthew with those of Luke, is quite as unphilosophical as to insist upon the literal accuracy of every word of both.—Under the title of “The Sling and the Stone,”* the Rev. Charles Voysey, Incumbent of Healaugh, has issued a series of sermons, of varying merit, in illustration of what “Free-speaking in the Church of England” may be. One of them, “The House of Rimmon,” has the felicitous property of irritating all Dissenters and nearly all Churchmen. The latter cannot be pleased at the comparison of their Church with the temple of a foul idolatry. The former must read with grave disapprobation the scorn poured upon conscientious Nonconformity. And the critic may smile to see how Mr. Voysey, who freely finds fault with the second commandment, and is quite sure that this and that precept cannot have come from the lips of Christ, has discovered in a Hebrew story, of imperfect historical authenticity, enough “for years past to calm his own mind, and to help him to remain faithful to his post.” It is only one instance the more to shew how light a weight of evidence will convince men of what they wish to believe!

Better specimens of free-speaking in the Church of England than Mr. Voysey’s sermons are Mr. Kirkman’s lectures, the titles of which are given below.† They are vigorous in thought and style alike, containing more than one passage of true manly eloquence. The importance of such teaching as this, given to a village congregation by its authorized religious guide, as a means of breaking down the defences of antiquated superstition, cannot be overestimated. In like manner, Mr. Barton contends, in a carefully written and moderate essay,‡ which, as we are informed, was first read at a clerical meeting, that the reality,

* *The Sling and the Stone, &c. Free-speaking in the Church of England.* By Charles Voysey, B.A., Incumbent of Healaugh. Parts I.—V. 1865-6.

† I. Truth against Tradition. II. Where is the Firmament which God created on the Second Day? III. The Rest and Refreshment of God on the Seventh Day. By T. P. Kirkman, M.A., F.R.S., Rector of Croft, near Warrington.

‡ *The Reality, but not the Duration, of Future Punishment is revealed: an Appeal to Scripture.* By John Barton, M.A., Curate of Rivenhall, Essex. London: Trübner.

but *not* the duration, of future punishment is revealed in Scripture: while Mr. Wolfe ably and temperately pleads for a revision of the Prayer Book and of the Authorized Version of the Bible,* in the interests of Christian unity, especially between the Church of England and the various bodies of Protestant Dissenters. There is no more remarkable sign of the times than the multiplication of such pamphlets as these. Almost every week we receive some fresh proof that clergymen are not only bringing their minds to bear upon controverted theological questions, in a quite unprecedented way, but venturing, unreprieved, to give their conclusions to the world. It is hard to say what hopes for the future of Christianity in England may not be justified by the change in public feeling indicated by these facts.

E.

* A Plea for the Revision of the Prayer Book and of the Authorized Version of the Bible. By Rev. Arthur Wolfe, M.A., Rector of Fornham All Saints, &c. London: Bell and Daldy. 1866.

THE THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. XIV.—JULY, 1866.

I.—THE RELIGION OF CHILDHOOD.

IN his last great work, "*Les Apôtres*," M. Renan prophesies that a hundred years to come the ostensible boundaries of Judaism, Catholicism and Protestantism, will not have undergone essential alteration. Each church, however, will then consist of two distinct classes of adherents—those who honestly believe in its doctrines, and those who disbelieve them altogether, but continue to pay them outward homage, and to conform to established rites, from motives of public policy, tenderness for the weak, romantic sentiment, or, perchance, indifference. Dogma will, in those happy times, be treated as a sacred ark, never to be opened, and therefore harmless even if empty.

We must beg leave to doubt that this millennium is as near as M. Renan supposes; nay, that it will ever arrive. The pure love of theoretic truth, which he justly lays down as the one proper motive for those historical researches which are undermining the popular creed, will hardly conduct men generally to lives of practical falsehood. To study with the simple desire of obtaining facts, regardless of the bearing such facts may have upon our most cherished prejudices, can scarcely be a good preparatory training for acting ever afterwards as if there were no such things as facts in the most solemn concerns of human existence. To arrive at the conclusion that the Divine mercy is withheld from no honest seeker, however many mental errors he may have ignorantly imbibed, is not precisely the same conclusion (albeit M. Renan would have it so) as that religious belief is of no consequence to the soul which entertains it,

and that it is just as possible to be noble with a base faith as with the purest—to love God when He is represented as a cruel and capricious Despot, as when He is revealed as the holy and blessed Father of all.

Rather do we believe that a very different future is before the world. The reaction has come from the belief of Christendom for eighteen centuries, that “everlasting fire” might be the penalty of even unwitting error concerning Trinities and Unities, Incarnations and Processions; and the first result of that reaction is very obviously and naturally to lead men to depreciate for a time the real value which must for ever belong to the possession of such religious truth as each soul may be permitted to grasp. Because an artificial extrinsic penalty upon error is no longer feared, the intrinsic and unchangeable value of truth is for a moment forgotten. But ere long a juster estimate will be made. That calm, earnest, fearless spirit of search, which distinguishes so strangely the great thinkers of pre-Christian times from the feverish and terror-haunted anxiety of those who followed them, will return to the world, and will become the habitual temper of all the wise and good. Men will no longer seek the waters of life, as in a tale of enchantment, because they can save the drinker from some fiend’s spell of torture or transport him to a fairy paradise. But they will seek them as when, after long, weary days of desert march, the traveller, dust-soiled and parched with thirst, sees Jordan eddying between its willowy banks, and flings himself on the grass and drinks its sweet waters and bends in its waves till they go over, even over his soul.

Religious errors imbibed in youth are like those hereditary maladies which may lie latent for years and perhaps never produce acute evil of any kind, but which also may at any time burst into painful and sharp disease. Human nature possesses sometimes such a tendency to all things healthy, bright and beautiful, that the most gloomy creeds fail to depress its natural buoyancy of hope and trustfulness, and the most immoral ones to soil its purity. We all know, and rejoice to know, many men, many more women, who are among the excellent of the earth, but who if they but succeeded (as they profess to aim to do) in likening themselves to the Deity they have imagined, would needs be transformed from the most gentle and pitiful to the most

cruel and relentless. The non-operative dogmas in such creeds as theirs would terrify them, could they but recognize them. But because of these blessed inconsistencies, numerous as they are, we must not suppose that such seeds of unmeasured evil as religious falsehoods, are always, or even oftenest, innocuous. Like the man with hereditary disease, the mischief may lie unperceived for years, while the course of his life is not such as to bring it into action. But an accident of most trivial kind, a blow to body or mind, a change of climate or mode of life, may suddenly develop what has been hidden so long, and the man may sink under a calamity which with healthier constitution he would have surmounted in safety.

On the other hand, no words can adequately describe the value of a religious faith which supplies the soul, we will not say with absolute and final truth, but with such measure of truth as is its sufficient bread of life, its pure and healthful sustenance. We may not always see that this is so. As error may lie long innocuous, so truth may remain latent in the mind, and, as it would seem, useless and unprofitable. The man who has been blessed with the priceless boon may go his way, and the "cares of the world and deceitfulness of riches," the thousand joys and sorrows, pursuits and interests, faults and follies of life, may carry him on year after year heeding but little the treasure he carries in his breast. Yet, even in his worst hours, that truth is a talisman to ennoble what might else be wholly base, to warm what might be all selfish, to purify and to cheer by half-understood influence over all thoughts and feelings. But it is in the supreme moments of life, the hours of agony or danger or temptation to mortal sin—the hours when it is given to us either to step down into a gulf whose bottom we may not find before the grave, or to spring back out of falsehood or bitterness or self-indulgence upon the higher level of truth and love and holiness—it is in *these* hours that true religious faith shews itself as the power of God unto salvation. *With* it, there is nothing man may not bear and do. Without it, he is in danger immeasurable. With a false creed—a creed false to the instincts of the soul, incapable of supplying its needs of reverence and love, such as they have been constituted by the Creator—a man's joys may cover the whole surface of his life; but

underneath, there is a cold, dark abyss of doubt and fear. He passes hastily on in the bright sunshine, but under his feet he knows the ice may at any time give way and crash beneath him. Happiness is to him the exception in the world of existence. The rule is sorrow and pain—endless sorrow, eternal pain. But he whose creed tells him of a God whom he can wholly love, entirely trust, even though his outward life may be full of gloom and toil, has for ever the consciousness of a great deep joy underlying all care and grief—a joy he pauses not always to contemplate, but which he knows is there, waiting for him whenever he turns to it; and his sorrows and all the sorrows of the world are in his sight but passing shadows which shall give place at last to everlasting bliss. His plot of earth may be barren and flowerless, and he may till it often in weariness and pain, but he would not exchange it for a paradise, for within it there is the well of water springing up into everlasting life.

The time will come, we are persuaded, when men will be more than ever awake to these facts of the value of true religious faith and the danger and misery of error. When this is the case, so far from becoming indifferentists and treating all creeds as alike, they will necessarily seek more earnestly than ever for truth, not under the scourge of the terrors of hell, but with a calm, deep appreciation of the intrinsic importance of such faith for its own sake. Will they then be content, as M. Renan supposes, to go on paying outward adhesion to churches whose office it is to teach the very errors from which they have escaped? Will they endure to perform solemn rites before God which have become to them solemn mockeries? Will they by their countenance and example keep for the young and uneducated the delusions from which every hour they thank God they have been themselves delivered? Will they act *lies* such as the saints of old went to the stake and the rack rather than be guilty of, because they have found higher, nobler, more heart-encouraging truths than it was given to those saints to know? We believe it not! The day will yet come when the conscience of mankind will recognize that it was for no delusion those martyrs died, no fictitious virtue of honesty of lips and brain, which our greater enlightenment has discovered to be but a fanaticism and a pre-

judica. It will be recognized that to *live* a lie is more base even than to speak a lie, and that a religious lie is the basest, because the cowardliest, of lies. It will be recognized that to mislead others by our example or teaching, is to do them a wrong and injury only to be measured by the tremendous realities of the spiritual and moral life into which we dare to interpose our falsehoods to serve, or frustrate, God's designs. It will be recognized that as religious truth is the greatest of treasures, so every word and deed by which we tamper therewith involves a dishonesty which, when all the cheats and thefts of this world's goods are forgotten and pardoned, the offender may need to weep over and repent.

If these views have in them any justice, the question so often asked in our day, "What religion shall we teach our children?" assumes new significance. That all-precious religious truth which year by year men will learn better to value and more simply to follow, how are the young to be taught to seek and aided to find it? How are we to guard them against that fatal pseudo-liberal indifference which would make of Christendom another China, with each man lauding his neighbour's religion and depreciating with mock humility his own? These are large questions, which for the general public correspond to the anxious private inquiry of so many parents: What shall we teach our children concerning God and Christ and the Bible? In what position ought we to place them as regards the popular theology, and the Churches wherein we were ourselves brought up, and whereto we now hold more or less loosely? In a word, what is the Religion for Childhood in our age and phase of thought?

With much distrust of our own power to deal with so great a theme or offer counsel to those who alone have practical knowledge of the training of children, we shall venture to attempt some answer to these questions in the following pages. It must happen to all who have striven to urge the claims of a creed founded upon consciousness rather than authority, to be frequently challenged by the inquiry, "How would your faith suit children and ignorant persons? It may be all very well for educated men and women, but how would it apply to the poor? How could you bring up a child under its simple doctrines?" The

faith which shrinks from such a challenge stands self-condemned. To prove that the most liberal theology need not do so, but has its blessed work to do for the child no less—perhaps even more—than for the man, will be our present task.

We shall assume for the purposes of the argument, that we address parents who are either Unitarians, or prepared to concede the leading doctrines of Unitarianism, whether they may be nominal members of other churches or professed Theists—in a word, persons whose views, whether privately entertained or openly avowed, lie between the mental latitudes of James Martineau and Francis Newman, and who would garrison the furthest outpost of a National Church with Colenso, or build a new "City of God" with Theodore Parker. To the vast numbers who at this moment may be included in this classification, must every day be added more, as the rising generation, naturally most frequently imbued with such ideas, themselves become parents and are called upon to decide how much of their own views, rather than those of their fathers, they shall bequeath to their children.

It might be thought at first sight and prior to experience of the fact, that in this latest Reformation, as in all preceding ones, it would be a matter of course for parents not only freely to transmit their religious ideas to their sons and daughters, but to take peculiar care to guard them against the errors they have renounced, and to instruct them in the truths they have gained. The children of the early Christians, Moslems, Protestants, were no doubt imbued to the uttermost of their parents' skill with the doctrines of their religion. The idea of teaching a young Huguenot to believe in the Real Presence or to worship the Virgin, or to send him to a school where he might learn to do so, would have been scarcely less than a crime in the eyes of his father and mother. Nay, to let him grow up with the idea that the question was an open one, and that his parents were as ready to see him choose a religion as a secular profession, and become a Romanist or a Jew as he might become a soldier or a physician,—this also would have seemed to them monstrous and even impious.

How far we are from such a view of parental duty, it is startling to reflect. Professed Unitarians, indeed, habitually

train their children in Unitarian principles, and lead them to the public services of their church. But even *they* continually allow motives of convenience or economy to induce them to send them to schools where they know that the young minds and hearts will be subjected to the fullest influences of orthodoxy. The whole tenor of their guidance is calculated, hardly so much to secure their children's intelligent adherence to the creed they themselves profess, as to afford them a fair option to accept it if they see fit. Of course there are many exceptions, but we venture to think this description may be taken as a true one as regards the majority of Unitarian families, and that the result may be traced in the innumerable lapses of the sons and daughters of Unitarians into the ranks of churches from whose errors a very moderate share of parental care and warning ought to have protected them. That worldly interest has some part in all this must perhaps be conceded. The social and (let it be added, shameful as it is) the matrimonial disadvantages of membership in a small sect, may make Unitarian parents less unwilling than they ought to be to sacrifice their sons' and daughters' spiritual for temporal benefit. We are persuaded, however, that far more often the motives of Unitarian parents, even of those who act most unguardedly, are higher than these. Many of them doubtless imagine that what is so clear to their minds will needs be clear to those of their children. Others suppose that even if their child receive false instruction at school, they will be able in a few weeks of holidays to supply an antidote of rational argument which shall neutralize the poison which month after month has been slowly infiltrated and taken up into the child's system of thought and feeling. Many more, having been themselves educated in the older and stricter Unitarian training, have never experienced and have formed no adequate idea of the evil, and of the tenacity of the darker doctrines of the popular creed. They think them *silly* rather than deadly. They have never known what it is to believe in Eternal Hell. They have never knelt to thank God when that horror of horrors was lifted from their souls. Nay, even their own boasted doctrine of the Divine Unity has been always to them a mere negation of Trinitarian error. They have never known the power of that flood of reverence and love when all the religious emotions,

long divided, confused and scattered, were turned at last into the one channel, and the same Lord was recognized as Creating, Redeeming and Sanctifying God. All these experiences, which belong to those who have been brought up in the old creed and through struggle and difficulty have reached to the new, are unknown to Unitarians born and educated in the church of Channing or Priestley. They almost marvel at the ardour of converts for truths—valuable indeed, they admit, in the highest degree, but still so obvious!—the very alphabet, to them, of religious knowledge. They as little expect their children to renounce these elementary truths and go back to the creeds their grandfathers renounced, as they expect them to give up modern geology and astronomy for those of the dark ages; and they take as little precaution to guard them against one mistake as the other. When the catastrophe arrives, and the entail of Unitarian truth is broken at the third generation, they are grieved and wounded; but perhaps even then they hardly realize all their child has lost of a more than royal inheritance which they were bound to transmit to him securely.

The case of those who are not members of the Unitarian Church, but who entertain Unitarian or Theistic opinions while nominally ranked with the orthodox, is of course still worse than the others. For them to bring up their children to believe as they do themselves is a real difficulty, and one they very rarely even try to surmount. Those who have not such definite views as to make them wish to break with the Church in which they were born, or, having them, lack courage to do so, are not very likely to train their children in clearer light and more true position. The extreme latitude of opinion which the laity enjoy in the Mother Church, makes it appear a needless and ungrateful effort to release ourselves from the arms which received us in baptism, and will (whatever be our offences) drop us gently and tenderly into the grave, but which, in all the interval between, will never exercise over us any forceful interference. How many thus remain in the Church because they are never called on by any test, or even inquiry, to renew or renounce their adherence to it—how many more remain with the idea of Colenso and *Presbyter Anglicanus*, that they have a right as members of the nation

to be members of the National Church, whatever their views may be of its doctrine—how many of all these there are now in England, it is not easy to tell. Such as they are while young men and women, their position perhaps entails little difficulty of a moral sort. But when they become parents the case is altered. Shall they have their children baptized? Shall they teach them to read the Bible and repeat the usual hymns and collects? Above all, shall they take them to church and make them learn prayers and listen to sermons all and each saturated with doctrines the parent disbelieves? On the other hand, shall they omit all these traditional processes and bring up the children—as their friends will assuredly say—like little heathens? The question is making many a father anxious, and giving many a mother the heart-ache, in England at this moment.

It must be owned that the case is beset with difficulties. Putting aside special family difficulties—difference of opinion between the two parents, interference of other relatives, and last, not least, the forbidden efforts of orthodox servants to impress children with their crude and cruel theology—putting all these aside, there remain the difficulties common to all. We cannot presume to offer counsel as to these difficulties in detail, but we venture to urge the consideration of a few general principles which, if approved, may serve as guides to decide the outline of conduct to be filled by each parent according to special circumstances.

In the first place, a critical spirit can never be rightly fostered in a child. It is not for one who has all the evidence yet to learn, and the processes also by which evidence must be weighed, to mount any seat of judgment and pronounce sentence. To lead a child to do so even in matters tenfold less solemn than those which pertain to religion, must needs distort the natural order and development of the faculties. Nay, more: the critical faculty, even when exercised in the plenitude of the powers of middle life, is always somewhat opposed to the instincts of reverence and humility, and only becomes good and noble when used under the spur of pure love of truth, and with all the caution and self-distrust which facts may warrant. Often must it have happened to all of us to feel how violent a revulsion is created when a sermon appealing to this faculty, and

demanding of us to revise arguments of history, philology, metaphysics, has followed suddenly upon prayers which for the time had restored us to a more humble, childlike attitude of mind. To be brought to realize somewhat of the distance between ourselves and the Divine Holiness, to feel some of the deeper emotions of penitence and aspiration, perhaps to pray in the true sense of prayer—and then, a moment afterwards, instead of having fresh moral life poured into us, with high thoughts of God and duty and immortality—instead of being lifted by our stronger brother into nearer gaze at the Supreme Goodness, to be suddenly called on to revise our intellectual stores, recall this detail of history and that fact of science, and then balance the validity of the arguments by which the preacher has appealed to us for a verdict of “Proven” or “Not proven,”—this is the weariness of preaching, this is the feast where the rich Intellect may be fed, but the hungry Soul goes empty away. There is no harm in it all. Perhaps it is very necessary that congregations should have such facts and arguments often placed before them; and if they are to be placed at all, they must needs be placed for critical free judgment. Only the religious sentiment and the religious intellect are brought into painful and jarring proximity, the attitude of the soul is altered too rudely.

But if this be so with us all in middle life, how much more incongruous must be anything like such critical judgment in a child! The most fatal and hopeless lack in any child's character is that of the feeling of reverence; and it would almost seem that when from any cause it is deficient, it is well-nigh impossible to create it afresh. But if a mode were to be devised for the extinction of reverence, it would manifestly be to set a child to pass its wretched little judgments on the opinions of those who constitute for it the world. Thus, whatever else a child ought to be taught about the popular religion, it is quite clear it must not be taught to set itself up to decide that such and such doctrines are foolish or absurd.

Secondly: We have been all a good deal misled by the vaunt of our ancestors, that a Christian child knows more about God than Socrates or Plato. We have a latent idea that it is our business to verify the boast, and stock a baby's mind with formulæ about that Ineffable Existence,

whose relations to us we may indeed learn, but whose awful Nature not all the wisdom of the immortal life may fully reveal to His creatures. Thus there is a constant effort to give a child notions about what could only be fitly treated as too solemn a mystery to pretend to have notions of at all; and the natural inquisitive questions of the pupil are not met by the grave warning which best would instil reverence and awe, but by efforts to give or correct ideas where no ideas may be. We have all been so accustomed to "Bodies of Divinity," Catechisms and Creeds, that we find it hard to imagine religion despoiled of such paraphernalia, and mothers ask, with an alarm which would be ludicrous were the subject less solemn: "What am I to teach my child if I am not to make him learn the Church Catechism, or the Shorter Catechism, or Watts' Catechism, or tell him the story of Adam and Eve and the apple, and Noah's ark, or the history of Elisha and the naughty boys, or the fate of Ananias and Sapphira? If all these things are to be left out, and the child is not even to know what each Person of the Trinity does for him, and what his godfathers and godmothers have promised he shall believe, what remains for me to teach him of religion?"

It is a startling idea to such good mothers to reflect that all these lessons are not religion at all, but instructions which much oftener turn their children from religion than engage them to love it, and that the utter cessation of such tasks would leave them open to far more devout feelings. "*No religious teaching?*" But can a mother, herself penetrated with religious feeling, teach *anything* to her child which shall not also teach him religion? Can she direct his mind to the objects around him, sun and star and bird and bee—can she lead him to check his little selfishnesses and angry passions, and be kind to his brothers and sisters and obedient to herself—can she read with him a single story or poem or book of infant science, in which the thought of God the Maker, God the Observer, God the Lord of all things beautiful and good, shall not shine over all her teachings? Religion entering in this its natural way is full of interest and delight to the child. Behind the dry facts, which have for him perhaps little value, he finds that meaning which elevates Fact into Truth. All things have a personal sense and purpose, since he is made to see a Personal

Will directing them all ; and by degrees the vast unity of the world, the unity of order, beauty and beneficence, dawns upon his soul.

Again : There is need to bear in mind that a child's faculties of love are given *data* in his nature. We have not got to create them, and we can in very small degree warp and alter them from what they have been created. They are so constituted as spontaneously to open to an object of one kind, and to shrink from an object of another. The task of him who believes children's hearts to be God's handiwork and not the Devil's, is to *educate* (draw out) what God has put there, and to present to those faculties as they grow that idea of God and duty which they are *made* to fasten upon with honour and love. Divines talk of children being wholly corrupt, and poets tell us they "trail clouds of glory ;" but parents neither find the corruption nor see much of the clouds of glory. It is a germ of a soul, rather than a soul either burdened with sin or "trailing" any foreknown light, which lies covered up in a little child's cradle. But assuredly it is a germ in which God has folded potentially all the blossoms of holy feelings man can know on earth. Surely it is a proof that any teaching *must* be wrong, when those sentiments God has made on purpose to love Himself and His holy law do not turn to Him as spontaneously as the young plant to the light. It must always be because it is not God, the true God, whom we have presented to the soul of the child, but some false one whom it was never made to love, that it has failed to lift itself to Him.

Again : The sense of sin is so deeply connected with the religious sentiment, it is so profoundly true that the holiness of God is first intimately revealed to us through the sense of our own unholy deeds and thoughts, that it is of the first importance in all religious teaching to place aright this matter of "the exceeding sinfulness of sin." No human piety, even the piety of a little innocent child, can live and bloom without some tears of penitence to water it. Nay, the readiness and fulness of repentance in early youth, the April flood of pure and blessed sorrow which falls so abundantly and then leaves the sky so clear and earth so tremulously bright, is it not evidence enough that repentance has its inevitable work even in the religious life of the infant ? But there is no part of religion which has been so cruelly

perverted as this. No theological dogmas impressed on a child's intellect can be half so mischievous as the practical moral training which distorts for it the natural processes of penitence and restoration; and no efforts of religious teachers have been so persistent as those which have been directed to this fatal aim. Starting with the wholly false conception of the highest religious life as if it were one perpetual sickly anxiety and "worrying about the soul," they are uneasy if their child enjoys a healthier state, and weeps only for a real fall, instead of puling continually from over-tenderness of conscience. A child's moral life ought to go on, like its physical life, all unconsciously to itself; but as the precocious offspring of over-anxious parents think of cold or heat or unwholesome food, the children of some religious people are made to know all about their own spiritual condition, and commence in the nursery a life of moral valetudinarianism. Of course such mistakes lie chiefly with Evangelical parents, and few Unitarians are likely to fall into them, but into opposite errors of which we shall speak presently. But the narrowness of a woman's life has undoubtedly a tendency to make mothers vastly exaggerate the lilliputian sins and miniature transgressions of their little kingdom, the nursery; and the result is too often an attempt to construct for its inhabitants a baby-house morality, wherein the true proportion of good and evil is lost, and the whole horrible mischief introduced of perpetual forced and untrue repentance. A wise mother once said to us—"I wish my children to know there are such things as great crimes in the world. It will teach them that their own little sins and bad feelings are not enormous offences, but are the seeds which, if unchecked, may grow to be enormous offences. I wish them to understand the *solidarity* of sin, that all sins are allied and interactive."

The opposite error of moral laxity and indifferentism is one into which parents who have themselves escaped from the evils of Calvinistic training are naturally most prone to fall. While one child's conscience is over-stimulated to the verge of disease, another finds its own instinctive penitence treated so lightly, its real faults passed over as if so trivial and unimportant, that it is impossible but that, with a

child's susceptibility to the opinion of those above it, the penitence soon dies away and the fault is repeated.

Now the parent who would hold the mean between these two errors, and neither excite a child's conscience to disease nor lull it to lethargy, has a most difficult task to perform in face of the common preaching and common juvenile religious literature of the day. Clergymen addressing audiences of grown men and women may well be excused if they consider that there is small danger of their adult hearers making too much of their sins, but much danger of their making too little. The most spirit-stirring, and probably on the whole the most useful, preachers in the orthodox churches are those who are for ever proclaiming "the wrath of God against sin," and urging their hearers to more earnest self-scrutiny and deeper penitence. But these spiritual medicines, meted out for the hard conscience of a man, are almost poison to the tender heart of the child; and the very solemnity of the place where the lesson is heard increases the power of the words to exaggerate and distort. Again: religious books for children and religious novels for the young are half of them written by women of sickly sentiment, full of that trivial, baby-house morality of which we have spoken; and the child whose mind is fed with such petty thoughts cannot possibly grow up to health and vigour of soul. It cannot be too often recalled—human beings have not got an infinite store of attention and reverence to bestow, insomuch that they may harmlessly lavish a great deal of either upon trifles, and then retain afterwards an equal amount ready for really important and sacred things. Waste of the spiritual emotions is the most fatal waste of which we can be guilty.

If the reader concede the principles now stated, the ground of debate regarding the religious education of a child will be found at least considerably narrowed. If the possession of religious truth be the most priceless of heritages—if a critical spirit must never be fostered in a child—if systems of theology and a store of cut-and-dried facts in divinity be no needful or desirable part of a child's religion—if a child's faculties of love and reverence be given *data*, and our task in relation to them to present to them their proper Object—if the due place to be given in moral train-

ing to sin and penitence be the most important and sacred part of education, wherein to err either on the side of exaggeration or underrating is well-nigh fatal—if all these things be so, then some of the following consequences may be fairly assumed to follow.

1st. The admission that religious truth is the most priceless of heritages must surely decide the question for each parent, what are the doctrines which he or she individually is morally bound to teach to son or daughter. Catholic and Calvinist parents, with their gloomy creeds, their gospels of evil tidings, still without hesitation feel it their duty to teach what is to them, subjectively, true. Common honesty, common regard for the welfare of their children, require it of them; and no greater causes of public and even national disturbance are found than the effort of rulers to interfere with this duty, and teach the child of a Catholic, Calvinism, or of a Jew, Catholicism. Shall, then, those whom we are addressing in this paper, whose creed (as *they* are at least persuaded) is truest of all, and ten thousand times a happier, holier, nobler faith than that of Rome or Geneva,—shall they alone hesitate as to whether they shall bring up their children in their own creed or that of their neighbours? How deplorable is it there should even be a question in such a matter! Yet question there is; and the actual practice of liberal-minded parents at this moment is so variable and devoid of fixed principle of action, that it would be ridiculous, were it not lamentable, to describe it. Here is a mother who does not believe a syllable of the popular theology, but brings up her daughters carefully to believe it all, and pretends to them that she believes it also, guarding them from the chance of reading a book or conversing with a person who could disturb their faith. Here is a father who allows his boys to be taught the whole system, which he himself believes to be as much a delusion as the vortices of Descartes; but he thinks to remedy some of the evil by applying an antidote in the shape of a little levity. Here is one who trains his child to criticise the opinions of those around, and to set up its small judgment over the mysteries of heaven and earth. Here is another who teaches “Elegant Extracts” of Christianity, and leaves the child by and by to discover that the authority for what it was told was true and what it was told was false, was precisely

one and the same. Here, again, is one who, from fear of "prejudicing" the child's mind, teaches him no religion at all, and thus loses for him for ever all the tender associations of youthful piety. Placed clearly before a parent's mind, the idea of deliberately teaching a child falsehood, or choosing for it secular advantage rather than spiritual benefit, would seem shocking and monstrous to all save the most worldly. But the falsehoods are popular falsehoods, filling the very air of English thought; the secular advantages offered by orthodoxy are tangible, considerable, every day present. The spiritual benefits of a pure creed (now we have ceased to believe in eternal penalties for error) are purely spiritual; and in the violent reaction from the old overestimate of the importance of opinion, it is a natural error of liberalism to overlook them. We see good men and women—nay, noble and saintly men and women—whose opinions are the furthest from our own; and many a parent may feel he would be content to see his son or daughter like them, and at the same time making "the best of both worlds" in the safe shelter of orthodoxy. But we forget perhaps that another generation will not stand where the last stood, and that the good fruit we admire did not indeed grow off the thorns of the Five Points of Calvinism, but off the true vine of Divine Love which wreathed itself around them. The *chance* that, if we plant only the thorns, the vine will grow over them, is one assuredly not to be counted upon.

2ndly. From the observation of the evil results of instilling a critical spirit at an age when a child cannot possibly possess either the materials or true method for forming a critical judgment, it follows that liberal parents, like others, must needs teach their religion to their children *didactically*. There lies here a great practical difficulty. On the one hand, we all know too well the evil and danger of bringing up a young mind to believe a whole mass of doctrines as certain and unquestionable, and then leaving it to find out at its entrance into independent life and when temptation is at its highest, that many of these doctrines, if not all of them, are utterly uncertain and doubtful. On the other hand, to teach a child to consider all the truths of the unseen world as matters of speculation, would be still more absurd and mischievous. To impart knowledge of them, and yet to impart at the same time that other knowledge,

that parents are not infallible, that no human knowledge is infallible, that to love Truth and search for it as for hid treasure, rather than to receive it unasked and undeserved, like the rain, is the duty and the lot of man,—to impart this must needs be a task of great delicacy and difficulty. It is to be remembered, however, that a child is always naturally disposed to look on his parents' opinions as final decisions, while the parents' mind bounds its narrow horizon of all wisdom. Thus to make a child understand that any doctrine is or is not true *in its parents' opinion*, is to give it at once the prestige of truth, and yet not to incur any risk of future break-down and discovery. By and by the child will learn what is the value of its parents' opinions on all matters, and if the parent be truly good and wise, that value will be very great indeed, though of course far short of absolute authority. In any case, the parent will obtain for his religious teaching precisely the respect it deserves to obtain—that of his own personal weight in the estimate of his son or daughter. How much this view of the proper nature of instruction adds to the responsibility of *forming* the opinions which are thus to be bequeathed as the most precious heritage, there is no need to tell. In this, as in all other things, a man or woman's responsibility in thought, feeling and action, seem to become doubled and quadrupled as they assume the holy rank of a father or a mother. Doubtless, many of them must in their hearts echo poor Margaret Fuller's exclamation: "I am the parent of an immortal soul! God be merciful to me—a sinner!"

3rdly. If we abandon the idea that children should be crammed with facts connected somehow with religion, and made capable of "telling more about God than Plato and Socrates" (much more indeed than it is likely Plato and Socrates can now tell after two thousand years of heaven), there will be an end in a great measure of the difficulty which now besets liberal parents in their inquiry, "What shall we teach our children of a Sunday?" With the imaginary necessity will disappear the imaginary duty of meeting it, and small Platos of five years old and Socrates in white frocks will no longer be made to pore over catechisms or repeat the beautiful collects like so many little parrots in a row. The abolition of those "burdens grievous to be borne," the wearisome Sunday lessons of childhood, would,

we believe, accomplish no small step towards making children love the religion they heard of in other and happier ways. Can anybody fancy the result of teaching "Affection to Parents" by a regular educational battery of catechisms and texts once a week? Would it make a child love its mother better? We rather imagine the reverse. Nor can we conceive why the analogous sentiment of love to the Father in heaven should follow a different law.

The old Hebrew prophet believed that a special blessing would come to those who "called the Sabbath a *delight*." It would seem to have been the peculiar pride of our Puritan fathers to make this blessing as difficult of attainment as possible, especially to children. Those to whom this paper is addressed need not be adjured to abandon the Puritanical Sabbath-keeping, whose memory returns to some of us as the dreariest recollection of youth—Sabbaths with the hardest lessons of the week, whose imperfect acquirement somehow involved double offence—Sabbaths with wearisome litanies and incomprehensible sermons through long bright summer mornings, when we sighed to run out and gather cowslips in the sweet green grass—Sabbaths with unwholesome cold meals crowded one on another, making young and old heavy and ill-tempered—Sabbaths toyless and joyless, when all books permitted to be read had the same indescribable flavour of unreal goodness, and whose perusal was accompanied by the same sense of soreness of the elbows and weariness of the poor little dangling legs! These are not Sabbaths which the children of liberal thinkers are likely ever to recall. But there would surely be a loss incurred the other way, were the Sunday obliterated from their childish calendar or made a purely secular holiday. There is no need it should be so. Calvinism and all the forms of the old theology appeal to grown men and women—to persons conscious of actual sin, and either need to be somewhat modified to meet the requirements of innocent childhood, or else distort childish souls to meet their darker lessons. But a true theology, whose basis shall be the spontaneous religious consciousness of our nature, will not be thus unfitted for childhood, nor will its simple and natural services be otherwise than delightful to the young mind and heart to whom the sentiments of awe and love are full of joy. Parents, we believe, will be obliged rather to

hold back and calm the fervent religious emotions of their children, than fictitiously to nurse them as now, when they have taught them to think of God as indeed He is, and not as the creeds have represented Him. We have known a few such happy children, and in nearly every case their mothers have said, "I hardly dare to speak to him much of religious things, he feels too much."

Bible-reading, again, is a difficulty. An education which should omit the study of the greatest of all books—a book which, in a literary sense alone, is to other books as Shakespeare is to the puny poets of the age of Queen Anne, and which, in a religious sense, is the quarry whence men will draw praise and prayer while the world remaineth—an education which should omit the study of the Bible, would be no education at all. Even as the chief historical document of the past, and the Guide-book (we had almost said, "idol") of half Christendom at present, the Bible is a fact no more to be ignored in the instruction of a child, than the existence of the sovereign or the capital city of its native country. But how is a child to read the Bible and not acquire the orthodox theology? Let us rather ask, Would any child construct for itself the orthodox theology if it were to ponder over the Bible for an age, provided it had not been previously taught to *find* that theology therein? That the idea of the Trinity and the "Plan of Salvation" would even occur to a child on reading the Gospels, we utterly disbelieve. What it would find there, beyond some beautiful stories and words of prayer and precept grandly sounding in its ears, it is hard to say. But a child's mind does not construct systems. The simple system of God's Unity and Fatherhood presented to it will more than suffice for its wants in this respect.

The evil which comes of Bible-reading for children surely arises from the ineradicable habit of treating the book mystically, and as differing, not in degree only, but utterly in kind, from other books. The child reads it long before any other history, and quite as a different lesson, therefore he thinks of Adam and Eve and Noah and Balaam quite otherwise than he thinks of the characters he reads of elsewhere. The writer knew a case of a boy whose education was conducted on the opposite principle. His parents (disciples of Theodore Parker) first gave him to read some of Mr. Cox's

beautiful Grecian stories, and then afterwards, without any special preparation, the book of Genesis. The little fellow, a clever child of eight or nine, was immensely delighted with it, but very manifestly had no other impression than that the Israelites believed in the One God and the Greeks in many false ones, and that the early legends of each might fitly be compared. He even found out for himself the resemblance between the story of Noah and Deucalion, of Jephtha's daughter and Iphigenia. To a child thus beginning it, the Bible would have a thousand good lessons, but no lesson of superstition. I may add that the same boy was without exception the most religious I ever knew, brave and true, and beautifully dutiful to his parents, and his early manhood bears no less excellent promise.

Finally, there is the church-going difficulty. Unitarians of course have a clear path before them; they naturally take their children to the chapels they themselves attend. The assurance that the worship in such chapels is addressed to the Supreme Father only, that the prayers are always of a pure and spiritual cast, and that the morals inculcated in the sermon are universally lofty and true,—all these are immense advantages which may well solve the question for any parent as to the desirability of bringing his child to public worship. But even Unitarians must feel how little of the service or sermon suited for intellectual men and women, *can*, by any effort of the minister, be made also suitable for little children. Some of the preaching, indeed, suggests rather the impression of the utter *unfitness* that childish ears should hear it and childish minds be called to judge in such controversies. The Evangelical teaching, over-stimulating to sickliness and burning out in brief flame of excitement the fuel of sentiment which should have warmed a life-time,—even this is hardly more injurious to a child than to be introduced in infancy to the polemics of the churches, and allowed to turn to the page of scepticism before it has learned the lesson of faith. As well might a primrose grow in a dusty arena, as the tender piety of youth flourish in the midst of theological controversy.

Liberal parents who take their children to the services of the Church of England have perhaps not so much to fear in the way of controversy from the pulpit, though they *may* be compelled to sit by silent and helpless while their

children hear their own profoundest convictions treated as criminal and abominable, and those who hold them condemned to everlasting fire. They *may* hear these things. But what they are sure to hear are doctrines they know to be false, and prayers which, according to their views, are mockeries as regards the things asked for, and well-nigh idolatrous as regards the Person at intervals addressed.

Is this, can this, be right? It seems as if we must have wandered far from simplicity and honesty before we can say so deliberately. Of course there are all sorts of moral expediencies in the case. The impression produced by a dignified *cultus*, by the sense of public opinion and sympathy, by all the historical associations and æsthetic influences belonging to the great National Church,—all these are excellent things to give a child. When it is added, that giving them cuts the knot of twenty petty difficulties which beset the course of keeping him at home, and that it is so much the natural order of the family that to diverge from it would require an effort,—when all these reflections are added, there is of course a goodly show of argument for the expediency of taking a child to church. But is there not a higher expediency which points a different way, that expediency of simple truth and honesty which must needs be the best guide to the ultimate good of any human soul?

Among the immoral stories of the Jewish Scriptures there is one which is always strangely slurred over by friends and foes—by friends because it is so indefensible, by foes because in condemning it they must condemn their own conduct. In the moment of his rapturous gratitude for his miraculous cure, we are told that Naaman bargained with the prophet, that his conversion to the worship of the true God was not to bind him from attending his sovereign and bowing to his idol in courtier fashion whenever desirable. The inspired prophet is recorded to have sanctioned this stipulation, and bade the deliberate hypocrite "Go in peace." Can this wretched story have had any influence? We hardly believe it, and yet it might pass for a parable of what is done every day in England. So commonly is it done, that to speak gravely of it as moral error sounds crude and rough, the residue of the harsh prejudices and trenchant ideas of bygone times. We have become accustomed to soften down everything of this kind, to concede

gracefully that every opinion is true in some sense or other, and that it is fanatical to make a stand against this phrase in a creed or that expression in a prayer, or talk as if the sin of idolatry could possibly be incurred in England in the nineteenth century. But it does not clearly appear how truth and sincerity have altered their characters, or why, because we are enabled to do better justice to our neighbour's views, we are to be less honest in following out our own. If, *to the individual concerned*, it be as clear a conviction that Christ is not the Infinite Deity as (according to the story) it was to Naaman that Rimmon was not, it remains to be shewn, how bowing to the one differs essentially as a moral act from bowing to the other.

These are matters of solemn import, rising to questions beyond the subject of this paper. Let it be remarked, at all events, that the free-thinking parent who means to make his son a thoroughly upright man, hardly sets about it in the best way, when he makes the most impressive action of his childish life consist in praying for things he believes are never granted to prayer, and paying divine worship to a Being he believes to have been a mortal man. When the two fallacies are discovered (as the parent who knows the current of modern thought must expect they will be) in the boy's advancing youth—when the son shall find out that the father taught him what he did not himself believe—how shall filial respect for the veracity of the parent survive, or an example of uprightness be derived from his conduct?

To conclude. The last principle laid down was this: That in teaching religion to a child, our task is not to distort and forcibly wrench aside the child's spontaneous sentiments, but to present to them the Object they are made by the Creator to love and reverence.

Let us for a moment revert to first principles to set before ourselves clearly what is the aim of religious education.

Each human love has its peculiar character. Parental love combines itself with tenderness and protection, filial love with reverence, conjugal love with passion, friendly love with esteem, brotherly and sisterly love with the sympathies and confidence of consanguinity. Love directed, not to child or parent, wife or friend, but to GOD, has also

its peculiar character. It is a love of Reverence, of Admiration, of Gratitude—above all, of absolute MORAL ALLEGIANCE, as to a rightful Moral Lord. Such sentiments as may be given to an unseen Creator, which are not of this character—the sentiments to which history bears horrible testimony, of raptures of devotion felt by wicked and cruel men who believed God to be as cruel and unjust as themselves—these sentiments do not constitute Love of God. They are hideous aberrations of the soul, diseased emotions addressed to an imaginary Being.

Again : The true love of God, of which we have spoken, is not merely a part of religion, or the ultimate aim of religion. It *is* religion. The dawn of it in the heart is the aurora of the eternal day which is to shine more and more perfectly through the ages without end. Till it begins, there is no real religion, only at best the preparation for religion.

Thus it follows that to awaken in a child's heart the true love of God, is the alpha and omega of religious education. Make it feel this love, and the highest good a creature can know has been secured for it. Fail to make it feel it, and the most elaborate instructions, the largest store of theological knowledge and religious precepts, are useless and absurd. In the battle of life, children taught everything *else* except this love, go forth like those mockeries of steamships the Chinese constructed to contend with ours, fitted with all the appliances which would have been useful had there been any engine within, but without that which should have given power and motion.

These are principles to which all will agree. Even Romanists say their colossal system of priestly mediation aims *at the end* to help souls to the love of God ; and Calvinists, whose dogmas make the Deity hateful, yet profess to instil them with the view of inspiring a love which can only be the reaction from fear. But the great difference between the followers of such churches and those who hold a happier faith must consist, not in the end all may contemplate as desirable, but in the means each may pursue for its attainment.

There is something very deplorable, when we reflect upon it, in the way in which mankind in all ages have sought to take by violence that kingdom of heaven whose golden gates are ever open to him who knocks thereat in filial

entreaty. From lands and times when they tortured the body, to days like our own in England when they only strive to wrench the affections and distort the judgment, the same all-pervading error may be traced. Naturally, men who have thus acted in the case of their own souls, have no scruple to act so in their children's behalf; and to drill a young mind to religion is conceived of from first to last as a difficult task, to be achieved by constant coercion of the spontaneous sentiments, and the enforcement of a duty naturally distasteful. It is an immense evidence of the readiness of the human heart to love the Divine Father, that, with the training usually given in this Christian land, so many are still found to resist its natural consequences, and to love God *in spite* of their education.

If a mother wished to make her boy grow up full of affection and respect for a father in India or Australia, how would she set about it? Would she first start with the notion that it would be a very hard thing to do, and contrary to the child's nature? Would she insist on it, morning, noon and night, as his severe duty? Would she talk of the absent parent in a conventional voice, and make addressing him by letter, or doing anything for him, a sterner task than any other? Lastly, would she perpetually tell the child that when the father came home, if he had not been obedient and was not affectionate to him, the father would turn him out of the house and bury him alive? Are these the methods by which a wife and mother's instincts would lead her to act? Surely we have only to imagine the reverse of all these—the popular processes of religious instruction—to find the true method for guiding children's hearts to love their Father in heaven. A child must *not* think it a hard thing, a task of fear and awe, a notion to be dragged into its lessons and its play to make them more irksome and less joyous, that it *ought* to be feeling what it does not feel. Above all things, the idea that such a thing is possible as an ultimate and final rejection by God ought never so much as to be presented to the mind of a child. A child can very well understand punishment; nor does it at all love the less, but rather the more, those who punish it justly and for its good. But punishment extending into infinity beyond justice—punishment whose aim and result is the evil, not the good, of the sufferer—this is an idea utterly opposed to

all the instincts of childhood. Of course the poor little mind takes in the shocking doctrine, presented to it like poison from its mother's hand. But the results are fatal. In one, it is indifference; in another, dislike; in another, an atrophy of the religious nature; in a fourth, a fever of terror, from which the soul escapes only by casting off all belief. Even when the most fortunate end is reached, and the man throws away in adult life the doctrine taught him in childhood, even then for long years the shadow remains over him. We return to early *fears*, as well as loves, many a time before we relinquish them for ever. The parent who would give his child a truly religious education, must make it his care to insure him (as he would insure him against listening to far lesser blasphemies) from ever even hearing of an Eternal Hell. This done, we firmly believe that, if he himself love God, he will find it the easiest of lessons to teach his child to love Him likewise. We must remember this: God's voice speaks in the heart of a child as in the heart of a man—nay, far more clearly than in the heart of a disobedient and world-encrusted man. To teach a child *Whose* voice that is, to make him identify it with the Giver of all good, the Creator of this world (so fresh and lovely in his young eyes!)—to do this is to give him religion. And the religion thus given will grow into fuller, maturer life, till it rises to the reality of prayer, the full blessedness of Divine communion.

A wise mother once told us she had taught her child a few simple prayers to repeat at morning and night, and then had given the advice to ask of God, whenever the child needed it, help to overcome her temptations, and to thank Him when she felt very happy. After some months she asked the little girl—"Tell me, my child, when you pray to God do you feel as if it were a *real* thing, as if there were Some One who heard you?" The child pondered a moment, and then replied—"Not when I say my prayers morning and evening, mama, I do not think I feel anything; but whenever I do as you told me, and just say to God what I am wanting, or how happy I am, I am *quite sure* He knows what I say."

Do we need better instance of how real and holy a thing may be the Religion of Childhood?

FRANCES POWER COBBE.

II.—ENGLISH PHILANTHROPY AND ENGLISH RELIGION.

MR. PEABODY'S munificent gift to the poor of London has a significance, apart from the practical benefit which it may confer upon its recipients, in recalling the traditions of an earlier age of philanthropy. Up to the time when Robert Nelson founded the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and Captain Coram established the Foundling Hospital, England owed her great charitable institutions to the liberality of individuals. Not only was it a royal act to endow a school or a college; not only does Eton (with its conjoint foundation at Cambridge) recall "her Henry's peaceful shade," and Christ's College the virtues of the boy king Edward VI.; but William of Wykeham still lives at Winchester and New College; Wolsey, had he no other claims to remembrance, could not be forgotten at Christchurch; the great Oxford Library perpetuates the name of Sir Thomas Bodley; and Guy's Hospital is a monument, "more enduring than brass," of the benevolent bookseller who gave the earnings of a lifetime to found it. Now we have changed all that. Our charitable institutions have indefinitely multiplied; we have a hospital for every form of human ailment, an asylum for every kind of disability; and secretarship is developing itself into a profession which requires a well-known type of character for its successful exercise. But societies rely far less upon the exceptional liberality of some one great benefactor than upon an indefinite number of small subscriptions. They depend upon the success of the appeal, legitimate or otherwise, which they are able to make to public feeling and opinion. And in the fact that there is a public opinion to which this appeal can be successfully made, lies the characteristic of the benevolence of our time. Charity is an item in every man's ledger. The number of those who systematically close their ears to every claim of philanthropy is few indeed. There is a way of opening almost every man's purse; some public object which almost every man can be induced to support. Perhaps one reason why enormous donations, like those of Mr. Peabody, are now much rarer than they once were, is, that they are commuted, in each case, into a perpetual

annuity. Many men pay £100 a year for charitable purposes, who would be either unable or unwilling to disburse in one sum the amount upon which £100 a year is interest at five per cent. And if, as may be alleged with some plausibility, philanthropy is the fashion, and there are those who give less out of any genuine love of God or goodwill to man than because they dare not face the social consequences of refusing to give, there must, after all, be something sound at the heart of the society which exacts from all its members at least a simulated benevolence, and makes the relief of human suffering, even if only by proxy, a condition of its approval.

Only less remarkable than this universal diffusion of the philanthropic spirit is the general recognition of the truth, that philanthropy has a religious basis; and not only that the love of man is inseparably connected with the love of God, but that all true service of God must manifest itself in active service of man. There can be no need to pause upon so obvious a truth; it will be sufficient to point out that the philanthropy which springs from a mere social and political expediency, is another and a meaner thing than the benevolence which sees in every man a member of the great family of God, having an inalienable right to all the privileges of human brotherhood. There is an interval, wide as from pole to pole, between the half-contemptuous, half-selfish care for the common weal, which would soothe the mob into sullen content by the gift of "panem et circenses," and the spirit of love—Christian in origin and nature, even when disowning the name of Christ—which sees in every individual of which that mob is composed a being capable of being lifted into a higher region of existence and endowed with a larger capacity of happiness. And that this is the prevailing spirit of modern English philanthropy it is impossible to doubt. Nothing is more hateful to the national mind than a religion which brings forth no fruit of good works. To the common apprehension, feeding the hungry and clothing the naked are acts which cover a multitude of sins. Meanness, selfishness, stinginess, a reluctance to assume the burthens, a readiness to evade the duties of public spirit, are, according to the popular code of morals, more unpardonable offences than the faults of impurity and self-indulgence against which

Christian churches direct their chief censure. In the following paper we propose to inquire into some of the forms in which this acknowledged relation between religion and philanthropy actually manifests itself ; to ask whether it is absolutely necessary that a religious should be also a denominational benevolence ; and to strike a balance of loss and gain in the instances in which it is so.

We may first note, not without regret, that the Christianity of the English people takes a denominational form. It is embodied, not in a single comprehensive church, but in many mutually exclusive and mutually repellent churches. These, for our present purpose, may be looked upon as standing upon precisely the same level, their ecclesiastical claims to pre-eminent or universal influence being important only in so far as they are recognized by the law. There is the Ancient Church, still consistently presenting itself as Catholic and supreme ; there is the Established Church, torn by internal dissensions, but making the most it can of its connection with the State ; there are the various bodies of Protestant Dissenters, claiming equality with all other churches before the law, and supplying what they each lack in numbers and social prestige by the ardour of rivalry and the activity of personal zeal. And the separate existence of these churches sufficiently demonstrates that, in regard to all philanthropic objects which have a distinctively religious side, they consider common action inexpedient or impossible. Take the case of missions to the heathen. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel represents one, the Church Missionary Society another party in the Church of England. The Congregationalists have the London Missionary Society ; the Baptists, each section of Methodists, the Scotch Presbyterians, a Society of their own. A partial exception to this rule, which we note with unfeigned pleasure, is afforded by the City Missions of London and some of our large towns, which are supported by Churchmen and Dissenters alike. But their peculiar character is indicated by the fact that they are Evangelical. In them, as in the so-called Evangelical Alliance, a common platform has been found in the profession of certain well-known doctrines. But the High-Churchman stands aloof from these associations, as decisively as the Unitarian is rejected by them ; and they are less comprehensive in reality, while wider in

appearance, than some at least of the churches from which they draw their support.

So long as theological opinion is in its present state, little fault can be found with this condition of things. Presently a wider and deeper study of religion may teach men that their real convictions do not differ as much as they are eager to believe; and that all human convictions are but imperfect and distorted representations of a great central reality which includes and transcends them all. Then it may be that, even in regard to the propagation of religious truth, men of various opinions will be able to unite, basing their union upon the thought that the fundamental truths which they all receive are of infinitely greater importance than the specific conceptions which are characteristic of each. But until churches have learned this lesson (which cuts absolutely athwart their most cherished prejudices), the simple instinct of truthfulness, perhaps more valuable than adherence to any single truth, shuts them up to separate action in purely religious matters. The High-Churchman cannot consent to forego his doctrine of the Sacraments. The Evangelical would rightly think himself unfaithful to Christ if he did not put forward the Vicarious Atonement in its naked simplicity. The Methodist and the Baptist forfeit their "*raison d'être*" if they conceal, one the new birth, the other the necessity of immersion. Men who, even in the awful presence of God, cannot so far forget their differences of insight as to be able to worship together, cannot unite upon the lower level of ecclesiastical activity. Those who are divided in aspiration cannot be one in action.

But there are many modes of philanthropic action which have not a distinctly religious side, although they may draw their secret origin from the sense of religious obligation. Every hospital in Europe owes its existence to him who was the great Physician of men's bodies as well as of their souls; though fortunately it has never yet occurred to any Englishman to classify patients according to the colour of their religious convictions, instead of by the nature of their ailments. Yet surely sectarian physic ought not to be a very strange conception to a people which accepts denominational education as the perfection of administrative wisdom; and if Catholic and Protestant children cannot expediently learn the multi-

plication-table on the same form, Catholic and Protestant fever ought not to lie upon adjacent beds. But we have not got quite as far as this yet, though there are signs of the times which shew that we are advancing towards it. Some such vague conviction as this it must have been which influenced the trustees of a county hospital, not long ago, to impose a religious test upon the candidates for the office of house-surgeon. No matter what proof of skill, care, kindness, a heretic might bring, a dutiful allegiance to the Church outweighed them all; and no patient, who was not hopelessly unreasonable as well as utterly irreligious would complain of being poisoned or neglected by a man who had sound views upon ritual and took the sacrament once a week. And within the last year or two it has happened more than once that a question of hospital attendance has been settled upon purely ecclesiastical principles. The nursing in this or that institution has been notoriously inefficient, and ladies of education, kindness, tact, have offered to devote themselves, for the love of God, to the laborious and ungrateful task. But, if they happened to be tinged by high Anglican views, still more if they were united in a voluntary association and distinguished by a particular garb, Evangelical wrath has been excited to the utmost by the insidious attack upon the great principles of the Reformation, and the city or county has been delivered over to social war. Perish the thought that a draught should be administered or a pillow smoothed by a believer in the Real Presence! Better callous neglect in the ordinary clothes of elderly womanhood, than the kindest care in a robe which conceals a crucifix! And at last, whichever side wins the day, a fatal wound is inflicted upon social charity, and the flame of theological hatred and contention is kindled upon the very spot which ought to have enjoyed a perpetual immunity from its heat and glare.

At the same time, these institutions, managed as they commonly are, have a reflex action upon the churches, the worth of which it is impossible to over-estimate. For we are not to suppose that, because the relation between the philanthropic work which they perform and the public ministrations of religion is unseen, it therefore does not exist. If religion and philanthropy,—being good and doing good,—are inseparably conjoined, so that either in its full

development includes the other, the church which fosters the truest and deepest religious life will be most successful also in sending into the vineyard of philanthropy men of a noble self-denial and a pure public spirit. Such will be ready to acknowledge that to Christianity, as taught in the church of their choice, they owe the largeness of heart, the patience of work, the energy of sacrifice, which they bring to their task. But the very narrowness of Church communion, forced upon them by faithfulness to intellectual conviction, kindles in them the desire that the brotherhood of philanthropy should be the widest possible. They feel that the lines of demarcation, which in theology they are reluctantly compelled to recognize, do not really run on into the region of beneficence; and, in the presence of human suffering which the most accordant effort can only partially relieve, are nobly impatient of unreal distinctions. They are conscious of a new development of power in themselves, as they work side by side with men who have received a different training; while the common task is advanced by the harmonious devotion of varying capabilities. In the board-room of the hospital, men learn, in the most practical and convincing way, a truth which the pulpit more often labours to obscure than to enforce—that their sense of duty, their sympathy with suffering, their allegiance to a Higher Power of Good, are fundamentally the same, and that it is impossible for theological dissensions to put asunder those who are firmly knit together in a fellowship of good works. As Christendom now is, the brotherhood of philanthropy alone preserves the image of the true Catholic Church.

There is, then, a field of philanthropic labour, the workers in which naturally and almost necessarily group themselves round a denominational centre. Such are Sunday-schools, Home and Foreign Missions. There is a second region of benevolent activity, where men for the most part forget their place in the Church to remember their place in the State, and toil together, not as Churchmen, Unitarians, Methodists, and the like, but simply as citizens. Such are Hospitals, Mechanics' Institutions, Savings' Banks, Friendly Societies. Between these lies a debateable ground (occupied chiefly, as we shall presently see, by organizations for primary education) which is liable to perpetual absorption on

either side. Sometimes the denominational principle makes a step in advance, and conquers for ecclesiastical rule some department of work hitherto reserved for what is half contemptuously called secular benevolence; sometimes reprisals are made on behalf of the larger charities of social life, and the separate action of the churches retires to make way for the influence of that wider church of goodwill which underlies them all. Of which tendency ought we to desire the success? Shall we deliberately suffer our churches to become the centres of philanthropic as well as of specifically religious activity, and so organize the national benevolence in the denominational form? Or, on the contrary, shall we endeavour to make the domain in which philanthropy is independent of ecclesiastical organization still larger than it is, and to base our union for purposes of benevolence upon no narrower a foundation than that of common citizenship?

Nothing could be a greater mistake than to represent this question as one between a religious and a secular benevolence. The churches must always supply the motive power of all true philanthropy. The alternative offered to them is simply this: shall they cluster round themselves and stamp their own peculiarities upon the institutions in which the kindly energies of their members are to find free play? or are they to send these forth into the great surrounding world of human misery and goodwill eager to spend themselves in the divine work of mercy, and ready to bear their part in the united effort of the nation against the common enemy? The question is not one which needs to be argued. All our readers will admit that the region of labour and sympathy upon which it is possible that Christians should meet without the sacrifice of conscientious conviction, should be widened to the largest practicable extent. All will admit that the happiest results may be expected to ensue from fellowship in benevolent work between those who are otherwise kept asunder by an impassable barrier of theological prejudice. All will admit that the social evils against which we strive—disease, ignorance, misery, drunkenness, sensual vice—are, in every sense of the word, matters of national concern, and that every man is bound to attempt their removal by the obligations involved in his citizenship. All will admit that, in

view of wretchedness and wrong so frightful, there can be no greater mockery of the universal mercy of God than to suffer theological hatreds and sectarian rivalries to mar the efforts of human goodwill. What, then, is to be said in favour of a denominational philanthropy? And by what means does it make a gain upon the larger and more humane principle which is opposed to it?

We have not a word to say against those whose denominational philanthropy is only temporary and provisional; who do good work in this way because they cannot yet do it in any other, and are unwilling to wait with folded hands for the dawn of a better day. But, in the first place, some of the mistakes against which we contend, arise from an erroneous view of the function of a church as a worshipping community. That function may be described in one word as religious, the awakening and fostering of the spiritual life. To bring the soul of every member of it into communion with the All-holy God, this alone is the work of a church; and when this is done, all is done. But in order to perform this work thoroughly, two subordinate functions must be fulfilled: the first, scientific; the second, practical. To a certain extent, not needful now to be precisely stated, the religious life rests upon the perception of theological truth, which must be defined, explained, defended. In another way, it is fed by the springs of practical beneficence; a purely sentimental religion which enters upon no opportunities of labour, courts no occasions of sacrifice, soon exhales; and an idle cannot be a deeply devout church. And from this it seems to be only a natural inference, that as the church provides for its members opportunities of religious communion and theological instruction, it should also provide a sphere of philanthropic activity; and that Day and Sunday schools, with all their multitude of subordinate agencies, should be invariable elements of church organization.

We admit at once that all institutions which have a directly religious object, are in their right place when gathered round and made dependent upon the congregation. We shall presently discuss by itself the question of general education. But what can be the object, or what the practical effect, of confining within ecclesiastical limits efforts which, except the motive spirit, have nothing distinctively

religious in them? Ought it not to be enough for the true purposes of a church that the spirit of self-sacrifice which it endeavours to infuse into its members should be nobly active, without requiring that it should be active within a given limited area? Is there not, when we come to look the matter fairly in the face, an inherent absurdity in establishing a Penny Bank or a Shoe Club upon a congregational basis? What is this but in effect to say to the needy, We will not store your pence or help to clothe your naked feet unless you come to our Sunday-school or worship in our chapel? Perhaps only those who are familiar with the minutiae of ecclesiastical benevolence are aware of the extent to which these arrangements are now carried. Their object seems to be to take the child from the first, and to supply all his social wants, in relation, not to the town or county of which he is an inhabitant, but to the congregation with which he or his parents are fortuitously connected. Sundays and week-days he receives instruction with the children of fellow-believers. There is a School or Chapel Library to supply a selected literature. There is a Sick Club, a Clothing Society, a Savings' Bank, within the walls of the Sunday-school. At a more advanced age, there is a Mutual Improvement Society to draw him away from the dangerous influences of the Mechanics' Institute. There is a subtle leavening of all social and political relations by the ecclesiastical spirit, which aims to make him forget the citizen in the Churchman, the Congregationalist, the Methodist. The idea of common schools, where children gathered out of all the churches should receive the elementary instruction with which churches have properly nothing to do, seems to have faded out of the mind of the English nation as an unattainable dream. But to have so completely lost our grasp of this idea is involving the loss of much more. We are persuaded that the increasing difficulty of sustaining Mechanics' Institutes and similar places of adult education, arises in part from the fierce competition carried on by churches and chapels, each doing all it can to keep its young men within the limits of its own school-room. And yet how much better, in every point of view, a central and strong Mechanics' Institute, with its friendly conflict of interests, its free interchange of thought, than half a score of petty societies, where young men perpetually look upon

the same faces, encounter the same ideas, and grow up into one likeness ! And how powerfully must it not tend to the increase of all that is mean and narrow and unlovely in our church life, thus to shut men out from all opportunities of intercourse and mutual influence upon the higher levels of humanity, and to confine their contact as far as possible to the fierce collisions of politics and the heated rivalries of trade !

So long as the denominational system of education is sanctioned and subsidized by the State, it will be difficult to take practical measures for remedying these mistakes. While the evils of national ignorance confront our efforts in undiminished virulence, and the zeal of congregations is almost the single force actually arrayed against them, it is all but inevitable that a very large part of the labour even of those who desire a broader basis of action should take an ecclesiastical form. Meanwhile we would record our protest against the supposition that the congregation which is not surrounded by a multitude of dependent philanthropic organizations must needs be deficient in genuine religious life. For a church without a Sunday-school—for a church, that is, which deliberately neglects the religious training of the young, and is too careless of its own deepest principles to wish to present them to the minds of others—we have not a word to say. But it is possible enough that, without a Day-school, its members may be the life of the common Schools of the town in which they dwell ; that, without a Mutual Improvement Society, they may infuse breadth and vigour into the counsels of the Mechanics' Institute ; that, without a Sick Club, they may largely bear the financial and administrative burthens of the Hospital. Is it better that they should bring their Christianity to the Board of Guardians or the Municipal Council-room, or that, leaving these to themselves, they should confine their labour within the limits of their sectarianism ? The church which makes every member eager and industrious for the common weal, and sends him into the city full of a broad charity and a wise public spirit, fulfils its function at least as adequately as that which seeks to retain within its own influence, and to stamp with its own impress, the benevolent energy of all who own allegiance to it. We have of late been accustomed to cite the English Presbyterians of the

religions in them.' Charity is not to be enough for the true purposes of a church, that the spirit of self-sacrifice which is essential to make the members should be nobly active without requiring that it should be active within a given limited area.' Is there not when we come to look at the matter simply in the face an inherent absurdity in establishing a Penny Bank or a Shoe Club upon a congregational basis? What is this but in effect to say to the needy, 'We will not spare your peace or help to clothe your naked persons, you must go to our Sunday-school or worship in our church.' Perhaps only those who are familiar with the history of ~~congregational~~ benevolence are aware of the error to which these arrangements are now carried. Their object seems to be to make the child from the first, and to keep all his social wings in relation, not to the town or county of which he is an inhabitant, but to the congregation with which he or his parents are fortuitously connected. ~~From the first~~ he receives instruction with the ~~members of the congregation.~~ There is a School or Chapel ~~where he receives a secular literature.~~ There is a Sick Fund, a Poor Society, a Savings' Bank, within the walls of the congregation. At a more advanced age, there is a Mutual Improvement Society to draw him away from the ~~mechanical~~ interests of the Mechanics' Institute. There is a ~~system~~ ~~of~~ ~~relation~~ of all social and political relations by the congregation, so that it tries to make him forget the place of the burgher, the Congregationalist, the Methodist. The idea of common schools, where children gathered out of all the churches should receive the elementary instruction with which churches have properly nothing to do, seems to have faded out of the mind of the English nation as an unattainable dream. But to have so completely lost our grasp of this idea is involving the loss of much more. We are persuaded that the increasing difficulty of sustaining Mechanics Institutes and similar places of adult education arises in part from the fierce competition carried on by churches and chapels, each doing all it can to keep its young men within the limits of its own influence. It is, we think, how much better, in every case, to have a strong Mechanics' Institute, which announces its free interchange of ~~young~~ ~~peoples~~ ~~societies~~ where y

So long as the denominational system of education is sanctioned and subsidized by the State, it will be difficult to take practical measures for remedying these mistakes. While the evils of national ignorance confront our efforts, in undiminished virulence, and the zeal of congregations is almost the single force actually arrayed against them, it is all but inevitable that a very large part of the labour even of those who desire a broader basis of action should take an ecclesiastical form. Meanwhile we would record our protest against the supposition that the congregation which is not surrounded by a multitude of dependent philanthropic organizations must needs be deficient in genuine religious life. For a church without a Sunday-school—for a church, that is, which deliberately neglects the religious training of the young, and is too careless of its own deepest principles to wish to present them to the minds of others—have not a word to say. But it is possible enough that, without a Day-school, its members may be the life of the common Schools of the town in which they dwell; that, without a Mutual Improvement Society, they may infuse vigour into the counsels of the Mechanics' Institute; that, without a Sick Club, they may largely bear the financial and administrative burthens of the Hospital. After that they should bring their Christianity to the Guardians or the Municipal Council-room, or that, these to the limited number of the church, they should confine their labour to the church itself. The church which is not a focus for the common life of a broad charity is not at least as adequate within its own influence, the benevolent press, the benevolent press. We have of late seen Presbyterians of the

last century as men without church life, in the sense in which we now understand those words. Yet, looking a little further, we are forced to confess that never men played a more manful part in every struggle for liberty and social progress, and that they contributed largely to victories which were won, not for themselves or their own church, but for the nation. Can it be that *their* church life was a nobler and larger thing than *ours* enables us to understand?

But the most important practical application of the principle of denominational philanthropy is in the domain of primary education. And it is important not only because of the magnitude of the region of public duty which is deliberately abandoned to its operation, but because it is sanctioned by a complicated system of administrative arrangements which have the combined force of usage and of law.

The education of the English people is conducted upon the basis of a compromise. It is possible, on the one side, to construct a system of instruction, supported by special rates or general taxation, and placed under a corresponding control either of the local authorities or of the central government. Nor, for the purpose of our present contrast, does it greatly matter whether such education be conceived of as optional or compulsory. It is possible, on the other, to leave the work of educating the people to the free operation of natural motives and interests; to trust the task of providing schools and schoolmasters to the sense of parental duty or the impulse of social benevolence. And in this case it will depend upon the organization of the religious life of a people whether benevolence in regard to this matter takes a denominational form or not. But in England we act upon neither of these principles with logical consistency. We affirm the duty of the State by an elaborate system of grants in aid of voluntary effort. But no grant is given except in aid of voluntary effort, and the flow of national help is suffered to be directed and regulated by the capricious impulses of philanthropy. We believe that the Committee of Council upon Education take precautions against the possibility of a particular district being crowded with rival schools; but the very principle on which they act leaves them without remedy against the opposite and more frequent evil. Where individual benevolence is active,

the help of the government is largely claimed and freely given; but there is absolutely no possibility of applying the money, which is raised from all places and all classes alike, to the educational needs of poor and neglected districts, where the inhabitants are all upon one level of indigence, or the owners of property are callously indifferent to its duties. While, again, almost as if it were intended to fix the denominational character upon all schools, some religious teaching is required of every one as an indispensable prerequisite of national assistance. The principle, maintained by many of the most thoughtful and benevolent men of our time, that, in a state of society like ours, the great bases of education can be laid without reference to theological theories (the needful knowledge of which it may safely be left to the parent and the minister of religion to impart), is absolutely ignored. A school such as that which, under the name of the "secular school," has for many years been most successfully conducted in Manchester, can receive no grants. Its supporters, gathered from all denominations, unite upon the belief that they can teach to the utterly neglected poor the first elements of intellectual and moral training, without calling in question the religious tenets which they individually hold. The State will have nothing to say to them. But if they were willing to abandon the catholicity of benevolence upon which this school is built up, and to allow it to take the impress of sectarian narrowness, the golden shower from Whitehall would descend upon the thirsty ground in grateful abundance.

The administrative methods of the English people are in no case remarkable for logical consistency, and in more senses than one the national life is regulated by compromises. But so strange a compromise as that which we have described above, can be due to no forces less strong than those which determine the peculiar form of our insular religiousness. It is first assumed as a principle utterly beyond dispute, that the education of the people is the legitimate function of the Church, or, in other words, that it is a task which ought to be executed by the citizen, not in his civic, but in his ecclesiastical capacity and relations. In the next place, organized bodies of Christians as a rule identify religion with the theological tenets peculiar to themselves, and demand the right of inculcating these at the same time and

by the same methods as the rudiments of intellectual and moral education. How is the State to deal with a practical question reduced to this condition of confusion and perplexity? Two courses are open to it: one, to suffer administrative common sense to override ecclesiastical pretensions, and, leaving a place for specific religious instruction of any and every hue, to make sufficient provision for primary secular instruction; the other, to allow its natural development to sectarianism, and to avoid the suspicion of partiality to any by extending a helping hand to all. The more timid course has been adopted, with what results we shall presently see. What we have now especially to notice is, that the principle of denominational philanthropy thus receives a formal sanction from the interpreters of the national will. It is admitted to be a good thing that the education of the people should be thrown down to the churches as a thing to be scrambled for, and that the degree in which provision is made for this greatest of national wants should largely depend upon the intensity of their rivalries. Meanwhile the State—which is no other than the nation in its corporate civic capacity—is held to perform its full duty in the matter, if it distribute an impartial encouragement to all the scramblers.

We are not about to argue the case of national as against voluntary education, *per se*. The present practice decides the issue in favour of national education. As far as the principle is concerned, there is no difference between a school which is wholly supported out of the rates, and one which accepts a grant in aid paid out of the general taxation of the country. But if the present system of denominational education, backed by the help of the State, can be shewn to be utterly powerless to provide for the necessities of the case, it will follow, *a fortiori*, that without that help it must lag still more hopelessly behind the wants of the time.

The present system probably works nowhere so well as in a country parish of moderate size, where the living is tolerably good and the incumbent's efforts are supported by resident proprietors of the land. Very likely there are no Dissenters; or what Dissenters there are are Methodists, who are not unwilling that their children should be taught the Church Catechism at the National School. The schools

are well built and adequate to the wants of the parish ; the parson and his curate know every family, and see that the children come to school ; the schoolmaster and his teaching are under direct and constant clerical supervision. But this is the rare case in which the civic and the ecclesiastical relations of the parish absolutely coincide ; where there is one church, one parson, one constable, one overseer ; and where, moreover, the clergyman has at his command what money he wants. But how does the system work in a poor parish ? The great tithes are impropriated ; the vicar has little or nothing to give ; the farmers do not see the good of an education for their labourers which, as they think, they do very well without for themselves ; there are no resident gentry ; and the impropriator of the tithes thinks he does his duty if he sends an annual five-pound note to the schools. In this case, the burthen, for the most part, falls upon the clergyman. He begs, he borrows, he denies himself luxuries, he works night and day for his school. It is, indeed, impossible to speak too highly of the services rendered by the clergy of the Church of England to the cause of national education. Their devotion to this great work may be in part inspired by overstrained conceptions of the function of their Church ; the education which is the result of their efforts may not be everything which the true social philosopher might desire ; but before the reality of that devotion, the earnestness of those efforts, all carping criticism should be silent. Wherever a new church is planted, a school is to be seen at its side, and has often been first in order of erection. Whatever other part of the parochial work is starved or neglected, this engages the clergyman's whole interest. We are persuaded that the sacrifices of money made to this object by the country clergy of England, stand in a far higher proportion to their income than those of any other class. For ourselves, so that the people are educated, we do not greatly care who does it ; and we are willing to accept a large dose of Anglican theology for the sake of the more carnal lore administered with it. But the Dissenting churches, who believe that a theology can be taught, and who have a theology to teach, have made the mistake of all others most fatal to their denominational interests, in thus suffering the Church of England almost to monopolize the field of primary education, and to indoctrinate the minds of more than one generation with her own principles.

But a new complication is introduced by the presence of Dissent in a rural parish. If it is sufficiently powerful—a not very frequent case—to establish a school of its own, side by side with the National School, the worst evils of the situation are avoided; though, even then, the separation at the period of education of those who are afterwards to discharge the duties and fulfil the charities of a common citizenship, would, anywhere but in England, be a thing sufficiently to be deprecated. But the parishes where the Dissenting minority is not strong enough to have its own school, and where the children of Nonconformists must either go to the National School or nowhere, are those for which the now notorious Conscience Clause attempts to provide. The object of this clause simply is to prevent the clerical managers of such a school from inculcating the doctrines of the Church of England upon children whose parents conscientiously object to such instruction. It is inconsistent with the religious liberty of the subject (so, we suppose, argue the Committee of Council) that theological instruction should be forced upon any child as a condition of secular education; it is inconsistent with civil rights that children should be debarred from attending the only school to which they have access, so long as that school is in part supported by taxation paid by all classes of the community. The National Society protest, the country clergy rebel, against this clause. Some schools go the length of self-denial involved in rejecting aid offered on such conditions. We are plainly upon the eve of a great conflict, in which a majority of the clergy will be found in a position of bitter hostility to the Government. What the issue will be must depend in the last resort upon the House of Commons, which may or may not be able to resist the weight of clerical influence that will inevitably be brought to bear upon it. But whatever the result, the break-down of the denominational system at this point is certain. If the Conscience Clause be enforced, the clergy—much as they may dislike the task, and patent as may be their unfitness for it—will be compelled to buy State aid at the price of becoming managers of mixed schools. If the clause be abandoned, the children of Nonconformists will be shut out from schools for the support of which their parents are taxed. And such a consummation, we venture to think, would be utterly and suddenly fatal to the whole system of grants in aid of denominational effort.

All these cases have, however, one thing in common; somehow or other the children are taught. The real obstacles to education in rural districts lie, not in the shortcomings of any system, but in considerations which are outside of all systems—the stolid indifference to teaching displayed by the labouring class and that immediately above it, and the strong temptation to the poor to add to their own wretched earnings the earnings of their children at the earliest possible moment. But it is very different when we come to the great centres of population. There it is impossible for any impartial judge not to convict denominational philanthropy of utter incapacity. Below the level reached by Day, Sunday, Ragged Schools, there is a stratum of ignorance and consequent lawlessness absolutely untouched. We will take, because we happen to have the statistics at hand, the case of Manchester and Salford,—a case which there is no reason to suppose more deplorable than that of any other city of equal magnitude.

The “Manchester and Salford Education Aid Society” was founded in February, 1864, by men of various religious denominations, who, believing that many children in their great city were growing up without any training, had devised a plan which would meet a part at least of the necessities of the case without wounding any theological susceptibilities. This was to subsidize existing schools, and to encourage the formation of new ones, by paying, wholly or in part, the school fees of children whose parents were ascertained to be unable to pay them for themselves. The choice of schools rests with the parents, though confined within the limits of the Society’s list. On this simple principle (it is unnecessary for our present purpose to go into the details of the Society’s regulations), 7200 children were being sent to school at the end of the year 1865; the amount of school fees paid by the Society during the last quarter of that year being £345. 15s. 6d., and the parents paying during the same period, for the same children, £131. 15s. 10d. In the first year of its existence, the Society had 103 schools on its list; in the second, this number had increased to 113. While this work was being accomplished, many facts before unsuspected forced themselves upon the attention of the Society, and it was resolved to organize a systematic canvas of the town. This has been in part accomplished, and with start-

ling result. A tenth part of the area of Manchester and Salford has been carefully examined ; some of the worst and most populous districts being not yet touched. "Everywhere," to use the words of the Report, "a majority of the children between the ages of three and twelve *are found to be neither at school nor at work.*" To descend to particulars, 7650 families have been visited, consisting of 37,975 persons. Of these, 23,988 were children ; 7804 above twelve years of age, 11,086 between three and twelve, 5098 under three. Of the 7804 above twelve, 112 were at school, 6424 at work, 1268 neither at school nor at work. Of the 11,086 between three and twelve, 762 were at work, 4537 at school, 5787 neither at school nor at work. Taking the total of children of all ages above three, living with parents or guardians, only 4649 were at school, 12,284 were at work, 11,704 must have been idling about the streets or something worse !

But the evidence as to the inability of voluntary effort to secure the primary education of the people in a city like Manchester, collected by this Society, is not all comprised in these bare figures. How is any voluntary effort to overcome the indifference of parents ? In some districts it was found that the number of cases in which parents could have paid for the teaching of the children, and did not care to do so, was all but equal to that of those whose inability was acknowledged. Even of children who, from the circumstances of their families, were felt to be fit recipients of the Society's aid, the number who could be induced to attend regularly was but a fraction of the whole ; while schoolmasters shewed a marked reluctance to undertake the ungrateful task of training these forlorn ones into habits of order and diligence. What is to be done in this case ? The Education Aid Society succeeds in laying hold of about 40 per cent. of the neglected childhood of Manchester, and even with this proportion can in many cases accomplish but little. Out of 13,180 children to whom grants had been made in the last quarter of 1865, only 7200 were actually attending school. If schools, for the most part in connection with churches and chapels, are slowly increasing in number, the population is also increasing at a perpetually augmenting speed. Are there any so zealous for the liberty of the parent as to maintain that a man ought to be suffered

to bring up his children in a way which absolutely excludes the possibility of their ever discharging the duties of citizenship? Or, when these terrible facts, in all their naked horror, are presented to the consciences of Christian men, will they suffer the dread of a too powerful Establishment, or the fear of the propagation of heresy, to weigh with them against the plain and imperious duty of snatching these children from an almost bestial ignorance? Would not any form of Christian belief, even the rudest, with its accompanying sense of duty, and instincts of kindness, and brightness of immortal hope, be better than a heathenism which, were it not that God had moulded human hearts out of nobler clay than most theologians will own, would be altogether loveless and hopeless? For ourselves, we cannot wonder that even the short experience of this Society should have brought its members, notwithstanding the wide difference of theory with which they began their work, to the unanimous expression of the opinion, that "the fact that the Society can only succeed in bringing about two-fifths of the neglected children of Manchester and Salford to school, and many of these for a very short time only, proclaims the inefficiency of even the best constituted voluntary associations to secure the primary instruction of the people."

Again: the present system, looked at as a method of voluntary national taxation, is at once inefficient and unjust. Inefficient, because it suffers any who will to evade this great public burthen, except in so far as they are compelled to contribute to the general taxation of the country; unjust, because it draws upon the resources of the dutiful and the liberal to repair the shortcomings of the careless and the selfish. The duty of educating the people, whether performed by national or individual effort, is a duty equally incumbent upon every member of the community; the only difference is that, as things are now, some fulfil and more evade it. In a rural parish, it commonly happens that the clergyman taxes his comparatively small income at a rate the bare proposition of which would terrify the squire and the farmers into dogged hostility to all schools whatever. This mill-owner spends hundreds a year in maintaining a model school for his work-people and their children; that, practically evades the provisions of the Factory Act by per-

mitting his half-time hands, at no expense to himself, to attend any wretched dame-school which is nearest the factory. Here, a land-owner would count it a blot upon his escutcheon were there any child upon his estate without the opportunity of instruction; there, is one who grudgingly doles out a few pounds in answer to the importunity of the parson, and washes his hands of all further responsibility. Is it not the last sacrifice of which benevolence is capable, to remedy the inertness of a neighbour who wants not the means, but the will, to do his duty? Under the present system, the righteous remain righteous; the filthy, filthy. Upon a district where there is an active sense of public duty in this matter, where schools are largely multiplied and liberally supported, national help is poured out with ungrudging hand; another, where men are content to let ignorance grow and fester in its own uncleanness, is left to its unheeded squalor. And from the operation of that illogical compromise between national and denominational effort which is the basis of our system of education, it follows that the neglected village is made to contribute to that which is well cared for; and the parish which lies under a pervading shadow of private meanness, is precisely that which is precluded from enjoying a single ray of national liberality.

What, under this system, would become of the densely populated districts of our great cities, were it not for the parochial organization of the Church of England, it is hard to say. That organization, with the spirit of which it is the natural expression, aided by the practical inviolability of consecrated sites, provides, even if rarely to an adequate extent, for the presence of church and schools in the midst of that dense network of close alleys and teeming streets, which would else be abandoned to a population without either the ability or the wish to organize a system of education for itself. A parish, no matter how poor, how filthy, how degraded, is an outwork which cannot be deserted; and the greater the peril, the more imperious the point of honour which keeps the soldier at his post. Whereas Non-conformist churches, having no given area of religious work except such as they may choose to occupy, are under a perpetual temptation to migrate, with chapel and schools, into the trim terraces, the stately squares of the quarters

where the well-to-do people to whom they look for support chiefly congregate. We are far from wishing to imply that they abandon to entire neglect the districts which they have left, or that their efforts in the way of Domestic Missions, Ragged Schools and the like, are not worthy of all praise. But these efforts are necessarily unsystematic. They do not even pretend to occupy the whole ground, but only attempt to cultivate a plot here and there. They cannot be animated by the spirit of concentrated personal responsibility which may well be felt by the clergy in charge of a fixed parish. The spectacle of the whole, vast, complex misery and godlessness of London, would terrify into inaction many a man who, if the work were fairly parcelled out, would hopefully engage in the evangelizing of two streets. At present it cannot be too strongly stated, that we are deluding ourselves if we believe that parochial schools, missions to the poor, Sunday-schools, do more than succeed in scratching the surface of the evil. There are wealth and willingness enough in the country to fight a winning battle even against its wretchedness and ignorance, could we fairly pit the one against the other; but the higher fails to leaven the lower, simply for want of being brought into effective contact with it. The most hideous sight to be seen in England—and it may be seen in other cities as well as in London—is the contrast between St. James and St. Giles, between Belgravia and Bethnal Green.

But if our signal and shameful failure in the education of the people be in part due to the denominational character of our philanthropy, it is not by any means the only evil which we are inclined to lay to its charge. Its necessary tendency is to contract the range of our sympathies, to induce us to give up to a religious "party" the kindly affections which were "meant for mankind." It shuts us up in the comparative isolation of our own objects, hopes, methods, instead of liberating us to learn and teach in the widest possible companionship of beneficence. It lowers the obligations of a common citizenship beneath the associations engendered by an accidental agreement in theological belief. It introduces into that service of humanity which is open to every tender heart, every self-forgetful will, the conscious rivalries and animosities which a varying comprehension of realities that are essentially incomprehen-

sible seems so strangely to generate. It wastes, by a prodigal and careless application, power which, if economically used, would be no more than able to accomplish its gigantic task ; and for want of looking towards its object with a single eye, errs *here* by redundancy, *there* by paucity of means. But its greatest sin of all is that it blends a second and a meaner motive with the simple desire to do good ; and for the effort to resemble the impartial tenderness of God, substitutes a not unconscious wish for the glory of a church or the aggrandizement of a sect.

Once more, let us repeat in the plainest possible terms the principle for the adoption of which we plead. Let religious organizations furnish the motives, but not the methods, of philanthropy. Let the aim of a Christian church be, not so much to gather round itself, as a centre, a varied array of benevolent institutions, as to send its members into their town or parish full of Christian kindness, animated by a wise public spirit, ready for all prompt self-sacrifice, willing to strike hands of co-operation with every fellow-citizen. The Church of Christ, one and indivisible, may, it is but too likely, never be revealed to mortal eye. But it needs only that men should obey the better instincts which, in presence of human suffering, stir all hearts, to inaugurate to-morrow an universal brotherhood of goodwill.

CHARLES BEARD.

III.—THE THEOLOGICAL POSITION IN SCOTLAND.

THE theological position in Scotland receives, we apprehend, south of the Border, slight study and scant justice. Passing sneers at the bigotry which is imagined to be a national characteristic ; scoffing jokes at some absurd inconsistency between conduct and creed ; perhaps even suggestions, if not charges, of hypocritical pretence,—are apt to take the place of calm and thoughtful inquiry into the earnest faith of a great nation. No man, however, can hope to understand Scotland until he recognizes the fact, that the living waters of a noble spiritual life are freely flowing beneath the outward crust of a technical creed ; and that

the religion of the country is, on the whole, genuine, healthful and sincere ; awakening and sustaining those deep and solemn experiences in which the egotism of dogma is lost in the awfulness of God.

Beneath forms of words which are obsolete to the educated thought of Europe, and a system of ecclesiastical government which is as essentially national as the Jewish theocracy in its origin and administrative methods, the churches of Scotland cherish a religious life which, while peculiar in its restraints, is also peculiar in its varied elements of strength ; and while in some directions formal and precise, in others is rich through the diversity of its operations, the harmonious co-existence of apparently contradictory influences, and the glowing warmth of its passions.

If there be submission to ecclesiastical authority which at times almost approaches the subservience rendered by members of the Roman Church, there is also that respect for the individual worshiper which reveres the father conducting the devotions of his household as a high priest at the altar. An acute logic which shrinks from no problem in the relationships between man and God, and is disposed to argue its theology on the grounds of metaphysical necessity, is united with an intense conviction of the weakness of man and the terror of sin, rendering argument dumb before a scheme of saving grace. A sober and regardful behaviour towards formal ceremonies does not restrain a national humour daringly exercised upon themes the most serious. The man who will be greatly interested in a treatise on the eighth chapter of Romans, as the chapter of chapters, will tell a tale of simple pathos so as to fill every eye with tears, or write a song of sweet lyric beauty. The Calvinist, who has personally no manner of doubt that his orthodoxy is of the strictest sort, may be found the quaint humourist, the clergyman being the favourite hero of his grotesque tale, or the lyric poet whose tender song shall be the best answer to his creed. There are circles of society, and those not the least cultured, wherein the Westminster Confession is accepted as a kind of approved and reputable resting-place, while speculative thoughts wander far and wide in the very wilfulness of daring activity. Hume is as large and full a type of the Scottish nation as Candlish, and Burns as Chalmers. The religious life of the people, there-

fore, cannot be fairly measured by the standards of that rigid system of Protestant theology so entwined with its history and so dear through heroic memories, as well as strong in living convictions. It is peculiarly blended with the lyric genius, the humour, the pathos, the speculative activity, the deep domestic affections, largely characteristic of the nation ; and he who merely condemns the creed, without understanding this deeper life, will achieve no conversion, because he touches no sympathy.

Scottish theology has hitherto existed under singular isolation from the scholarship of Europe, and the most familiar results of modern criticism wear the aspect and enjoy the reception of startling novelties. At last, however, a great movement of thought is making itself manifest by no uncertain signs ; and friends and foes are alike astonished at the depth to which it has penetrated and the area over which it has spread. The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has received the following petition :

"That your petitioners consider that circumstances have occurred which render it of the utmost importance that you should take such steps as to your wisdom may seem best,—

"*First.* For inviolably maintaining the Westminster Confession of Faith as the doctrinal standard of the Church.

"*Second.* For securing adherence to the simple forms of the Church, and for preventing any change from being made in the same, without competent authority."

This petition was subscribed by upwards of 500 noblemen and gentlemen, many of whom have large powers of patronage, and sufficiently indicates the strength of the circumstances against which it protests. These circumstances, indeed, are rather influences than events ; but they are therefore the more notable, since it is the atmosphere of thought which is changing,—a matter of far greater moment than the existence of a few isolated cases of heresy. As Mr. Charteris shrewdly pointed out in the famous Sabbath debate in the Glasgow Presbytery, a course of reasoning may be far more unsound than a practical conclusion. "I do regret (said the speaker) that Dr. Macleod, in order to reach certain practical conclusions, has followed a course of reasoning which I believe to be unsound and dangerous." It is this unsound and dangerous course of reasoning which is most justly dreaded by the adherents of ancient forms,

and which we welcome as in harmony with that movement of modern thought which through educated Europe is broadening the foundations of the church of Christ and God.

Numerous overtures were presented to the Assembly of the same tenor as the petition; setting forth that the worship, government and doctrine of the National Church have been assailed, and sentiments have been avowed tending to discredit the authority of the Confession of Faith as a testimony to scriptural truth, and to encourage the tampering with the obligations which subscription to it involves.* It appears to us that the fears of the Presbyteries are amply justified by the facts. Those who really believe that the Westminster Confession supplies the terms both of a doctrinal standard and of a solemn contract with the State, have good reason to be alarmed and to seek for new protections to the bulwarks of their Zion.

No less an authority than Dr. Macleod has declared, not only that he does not think it is possible any Confession can be framed in which there will not be some point to which men may take exception, but that he does not believe there is a single man in the Church of Scotland who does not take exception to some little point, it may be a very small point indeed, in the Confession of Faith actually accepted.† The Duke of Argyll has publicly stated, and the statement was not contradicted, at a meeting embracing representative clergymen of almost every orthodox denomination, that there are matters entered into in the Confession of Faith, and doctrines laid down, which, he apprehends, no man now believes.‡ Yet more remarkable is the pamphlet published by Dr. Tulloch, Principal and Professor of Theology, St. Mary's College, in the University of St. Andrews;§ in which a profound conviction is expressed, that religious thought in Scotland, no less than in England, has already entered upon a movement which is destined to remould dogmatic belief more largely than any

* Overture from Presbytery of Linlithgow (May 30, 1866). See also Overtures from Synod of Merse and Teviotdale, and from Presbyteries of Caithness, Wigtown and Cairnston.

† Speech in Presbytery of Glasgow, Nov. 21, 1865.

‡ Meeting of National Bible Society, Glasgow, Jan. 9, 1866.

§ Theological Controversy, with Appendix on the Study of the Confession of Faith. By John Tulloch, D.D. Blackwood and Sons. 1865.

previous movement in the history of the Church, and that it is well-nigh impossible the old relation of the Church to the Westminster Confession can continue. With consummate ability and deep moral earnestness, it is maintained that the Confession was, in its origin and principles, the manifesto of a great religious party which had gathered to itself during a long struggle many peculiarities of faith, policy and manners; and is no exception, therefore, to the general rule that all Protestant creeds are stamped with the infirmities, no less than with the nobleness, of the men who made them.

"Seeing, therefore, that creeds generally bear so strongly the stamp of their time, and that the Confession of Faith, both from its length and the multitude of its details, and from the deeply marked peculiarities of the party with which it originated, is not only no exception to this common law, but on the contrary a signal illustration of it, it must be obvious how impossible it is to understand it, without the study of its time and the men who chiefly figured in it, and whose labours and writings gave the chief direction to its religious thought. Had these men, indeed, enjoyed any special divine guidance, had they even been men of special spiritual elevation above the prevailing tendencies of their age, their work might have stood by itself, and been, if not fully yet largely intelligible apart from a knowledge of the influences which surrounded and moulded them. But so far from being men of such a character, they were men peculiarly under the influences and the prejudices of their time—men whose intellectual and spiritual life, as they can yet be traced, were scored deeply by the pervading lines of its special currents of thought and feeling; and who have transferred these lines everywhere to the dogmatic structure which they built up in committee slowly amidst many interruptions, in the Jerusalem Chamber, 'a fair room in the Abbey of Westminster.'"^{*}

If the Confession was thus elaborated by men who were peculiarly under the prejudices of their time, and who have transferred these lines everywhere to the dogmatic structure they upbuilt, in what sense can it be received by the scholars of the 19th century as the Confession of their own personal faith? The whole question indeed of subscription is assuming a striking prominence in the theological struggles of Scotland. Dr. Tulloch quotes with approbation, as rapidly

^{*} Pp. 28, 29.

verifying itself, the saying of Principal Robertson, when he retired towards the close of the last century from the active part which he had taken in the Church's affairs, that the propriety of formulas of faith would prove the great question of the age. We believe that it will sooner come to a direct issue in Scotland than England. The Westminster Confession does not partake of that character of compromise which distinguishes the authoritative documents of the English Church. Its chapters elaborate a distinct system of theology. The ecclesiastical courts prepared to enforce its acceptance are sharp and decisive in their action, while their verdicts are popular votes rather than judicial decisions. The situations of the different parties in the controversy also are rapidly becoming more marked and antagonistic.

In the National Church we of course find the strongest tendency to relax the terms of subscription. In stating the arguments used in Scotland upon this matter, we shall endeavour to avoid all personal accusations. There are men of honourable character who combine a noble daring of thought with a holy piety of soul, and are as distinguished for Christian devoutness as for high scholarship, who justify or at least excuse subscription to the Westminster Confession upon terms to which we dare not submit. Against such we utter no impatient word of judgment. The first prayer of any man compelled by a sense of duty to take part in theological controversy, should be for God to give him strength to utter on the house-top what he hears in the secret chamber of the soul, and grace to restrain any word of discourtesy or offence against an opponent, however orthodox or heterodox his opinion may be. Under the present circumstances of Scotland, when the standards of the Church contain doctrines to some part of which (according to the high authorities we have quoted) it is probable there is not a single member who does not take exception, the question how far ministers and elders ought to believe the document to which they attach their signatures, demands calm study in the spirit of mutual respect, and not of party denunciation.

It is maintained by Dr. Lee that the State has sanctioned the Confession only so far as it contains "the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Church." The whole passage is remarkable.

"Where is the Church, where is the body, where is the sect, outside ourselves, which truly holds to this document in the sense intended by those who formed it? Now, as to the compact between us and the State, it is perfectly true that the Confession of Faith has the sanction of the State and of the law of this country. We need not, therefore, make protestations that we will adhere to it. We must adhere to it. The Confession of Faith is an Act of Parliament; not, I am happy to say, without some proof shewing that the men who prepared it were not inspired. They have made the most egregious blunders in their applications of Scripture contained in these proofs. Nay, they were so little illuminated that they have quoted passages, not only spurious, but no parts of the Word of God at all, in proof of their assertions. But I say we need not protest that we will adhere to the Confession of Faith. Why, these protestations seem to me to have an ugly appearance, just as when a man protests too much it is a dangerous thing, and tends to bring his sincerity into suspicion. I believe it ought to be taken for granted that, because we are the National Church, and because we individually are members of that Church, we do adhere to the law of the Church, and to the doctrine of the Church as by law established. It is not creditable—it is not to our honour—that we should be throwing about accusations of the description which we so often hear. But while I say what everybody knows, that the Confession of Faith is an Act of Parliament, I am not sure that we are quite correct in all our applications on this subject. I am not quite certain that the State has imposed it upon the Church—in fact, it did not impose it upon the Church; it consented, at the request of the people of Scotland, to sanction it; but I rather think that a Court of Law would hold that it only sanctions the general doctrine, and does not commit its sanction to every particular expression or position in that Confession. For the words in which the Confession of Faith was ratified are somewhat peculiar. I am quoting from the Act of 1690—'Like as they by these presents ratify and establish the Confession of Faith now read in their presence, and hold it proven as a public and avowed Confession of this Church, containing the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Church.' I think it may very well be argued from these words that the State has sanctioned the Confession only so far as it contains 'the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Church,' and that it does not sanction it so far as it may contain, as it undoubtedly does, some positions which are not according to the doctrine of the Reformed Church. I do not say this is the case; but I say it is doubtful whether it be

not the case, and I rather suspect that the Courts of Law, who are the proper interpreters, and the only proper interpreters, of an Act of Parliament, would not construe the Confession in any other sense. * * * If the General Assembly would but listen to the advice of a humble individual who is not the least concerned, I venture to say, for the prosperity and stability of the Church of Scotland, then, in particular, I would seriously advise that the term of subscription be made literally according to the law.”*

But what is the sum and substance of the doctrines of the Reformed Church, even supposing Dr. Lee's interpretation of the Act of 1690 to be correct? Many of the doctrines which modern criticism especially challenges, were doctrines of the Reformed Church in an intensely characteristic sense. If, for example, we believe the Bible not simply wrongly interpreted, but mistaken in its science, and decline to receive every book it contains as an infallible authority, we doubt a doctrine which was emphatically a doctrine of the Reformed Church. Freedom to interpret the Bible might be claimed, but no Reformed Church would for a moment have permitted liberty to question the truth of any part of the Bible itself. Were not the doctrines of an exclusive salvation and an everlasting hell considered by the Reformed Churches of the age of the Confession so vital, that any doubt of their truth involved dismission from membership, if not purification by very tangible fire? We are willing to grant Dr. Lee the widest test, and to consider as part of the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, only that, denial of which would not have brought about hanging or burning at Geneva, and yet submit that signature, if it have no further legal significance than he claims, involves adhesion to the darkest spots in the standards of his Church.

Moreover, Dr. Tulloch describes the Confession of Faith as actually containing the religious philosophy of the Reformed Churches, everywhere stamped upon it in a peculiar and especial sense.

“But not only must the spirit of the time be carefully studied in its characteristic writings in order to understand the Confession of Faith. The religious philosophy which, passing chiefly from Geneva to Holland, and from Holland to Scotland, formed, as it were, the great backbone of the religious thought of the age,

* Speech of Dr. Lee in General Assembly, May 30, 1866.

around which all subsidiary elements of Puritan activity gathered, must moreover be carefully studied. This religious philosophy is as marked in its way as any of the great developments of religious speculation in the history of the Church. Resting on and embracing earlier elements which may be traced at least to Augustine, it had yet struck out certain ideas of its own, or at least given to those ideas a prominent development such as they had not hitherto received,—such ideas, for example, as *law and covenant*—ideas of *forensic justice* and *administrative order*, which, while they cannot be said to be unknown to the earlier catholic development of Christian theology, were yet certainly applied by the Genevan and Dutch theologies to the explanation of Christian mysteries in a manner and with a confidence hitherto unexampled. Francis Turretin, Cocceius, and Witsius, were the great expounders of these ideas; and the works of the former and the latter remain their classical exposition to this day. Henderson, Rutherford, and Gillespie—the Scottish theologians to whom we are indebted for the Confession of Faith—were contemporaries and, in the main, close followers of these men—of their spirit, their method, and their principles. Their peculiar religious philosophy has stamped its impress everywhere upon the Confession of Faith; and it is a simple necessity, therefore, for every student of it to ascend to these sources before he can fully comprehend many of its root-ideas and characteristic phraseology.”*

We reply, therefore, to this part of Dr. Lee’s argument, that the free Biblical critic and the theologian who delights to know God’s mercy as wide as God’s family is large, and who would make less prominent in a gospel of love the ideas of law and covenant and forensic justice, cannot sign the Westminster Confession, even with the proviso that he receives only the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, except on the principle that he subscribes to that which he does not absolutely believe.

There is another point—the minister and elder actually subscribe to those clauses of stringency which the Assembly has added. It may be not legal (as Dr. Lee urges) to make men declare that Presbyterianism is not only true, but according to the Word of God; and yet men *are made* solemnly to declare it before they are permitted to enter upon offices of the Church. Can it be maintained that if a man solemnly makes certain declarations, and on the faith of those declarations enjoys his position in the Church, the

burden of moral obligation is removed, because they are enjoined by the Assembly in the exercise of an authority which possibly may be *ultra vires*, but which has never yet been challenged?

And what are the terms of subscription which Dr. Lee deems legal, and of which he greatly approves? The preacher is to own the Confession of Faith as the "confession of his faith," and "the doctrine therein contained to be the true doctrine which he will constantly adhere to." The Westminster Confession is thus made most emphatically and distinctly a Confession of *personal* faith, and it is taken as an obligation upon the individual mind and conscience. It is not permitted to occupy the position of an historical document. There is no open door for its explanation, as embodying modes of thought which in their day were truer than other modes of thought to which they were opposed. The burden is flung back upon the living soul of the man who puts his hand to paper and subscribes to the terms.

How, again, can a man pledge himself "constantly to adhere" to a certain doctrine, and from whom is the pledge exacted? The impossibility is demanded from young men in the fresh activity of intellectual life! What an insult it would be to a young chemist or astronomer to ask him to give a solemn pledge in the sight of man and God, that he will constantly adhere to the doctrine with which he commences life; and yet the young theologian is to be subjected to a condition which surrenders his very right to think!

The legal argument relied upon by Dr. Lee thus appears to us to fail as an argument likely to prove of any practical service in procuring relaxation of the terms of subscription in the National Church. A curious and striking commentary may be read in the fact that the General Assembly, without a division, pronounced the following decision upon the overtures "on adherence to the doctrines and standards of the Church:"*

"The General Assembly having received the Overtures, hereby direct and enjoin all the judicatories of the Church to see that all persons who have signed the Confession of Faith, shall not directly or indirectly depart therefrom, but shall loyally and consistently adhere thereto."

* Proceedings of General Assembly, May 30, 1866.

Another course of argument has been sketched by Dr. Macleod as satisfactory to his own mind. Certain parts of his manly speech upon the Sabbath are opposed to statements in the standards of doctrine, and he claims his Christian liberty on the following grounds :

“With regard to the principles by which I shall be guided, I would say this—you have made me speak suddenly upon this question, as intricate a one as I know ; but this I would say, that I do not think any Church on earth can exist without a Confession. It seems to me to be an impossibility. You must have a Confession. But I hardly think it possible that you could ever draw up any Confession to some point of which there might not be exception taken. I believe if you had the Apostles’ Creed to-morrow for your Confession, you might get a crotchety man, a man who had what I might call a morbid conscientiousness, taking exception to such a thing as that of Christ descending into hell. I do not think it is possible you can ever frame any Confession in which there will not be some point to which men may take exception. I do not believe there is a single man in the Church of Scotland who does not take exception to some little point, it may be a very small point indeed, in the Confession of Faith. Now, where are you to draw the line ? Where are you to say, ‘You may come here, but do not go beyond’ ? I do not think you can ever draw the line in words but in this way, and in this way only it may be done, and that is, to have every man tried upon his own particular case. Let him be tried upon the particular point to which he may take exception ; let him be judged, not merely on the cold logic of ‘False in one, false in all ;’ but let him be tried by the judgment of the Christian Church, of the Christian Courts ; let him be tried and judged whether that is a point on which he may not have Christian liberty. These are my general sentiments ; and so, if upon this point my brethren should deem it their duty, it is between them and God to ask me to consider this, and not to give me the Christian liberty of judging for myself, then so be it.”*

There is no subtlety, but a true and genuine ring of honest conviction, in this passage, which represents the feeling of many liberal men. But we cannot accept it as an argument on behalf of subscription. A Church not only can exist, but does exist, without demanding signature to a Confession. The Presbyterian and Unitarian churches of England not only exist, but sustain academic institutions,

* Speech in Presbytery of Glasgow, Nov. 21, 1865.

and are growing in strength ; although a young man may pass from college into the ministry, and administer the various ordinances of the Christian church, without signing any document or undergoing any test examination whatever regarding his creed. If no Confession can be framed to which some one may not take exception, why cannot the Church trust the vitality of God's truth? Let theology be studied as freely as any science, and the light which lighteth every man who cometh into the world shall surely guide into the paths of truth. Instead of arguing that because no creed can be brought to a man in which he precisely believes, therefore he must have liberty, we rather argue against the justice of enforcing signature. A man who has signed a Confession, has, we submit, surrendered his liberty upon certain terms, the dissenting portions of the community being subjected to disadvantages because they will not accept these conditions.

Dr. Tulloch's argument upon the question under discussion is more vague. In one sense (he urges), that which has been once done cannot be undone ; and there is no man with a large intelligence of Christian history who would be disposed simply to abandon the Confession, as some of the clergy of the last century did, but changes may be made in the relation of existing beliefs to these documents of a former period—no church being able, however, to abandon its doctrinal substructure except under peril of dissolution.*

The language used, indeed, by Dr. Tulloch and others of the same school of thought appears to us that which might have been used by an enlightened Pagan as a protest against Paul, and an educated Catholic as a reply to Luther, the phraseology being changed, but the essential argument preserved. It is language in which the Jew might have answered our Saviour when he spake of putting new wine into new bottles. A large intelligence of Christian history cannot veil the fact that there have been grave times and seasons in which the dogmatic substructure of the past has been cast aside, and the "peril of dissolution" has been dared for the majesty of Reformation. These are the epochs in the religious history of man when courage is

wisdom, and the difficulties attending the effectual working of all ecclesiastical organizations are conquered by the prudence which there is in daring.

An epoch of Reformation is again, we believe, in the world. As the first Christians left Paganism, and as Luther, one poor monk, stood against Rome, so we claim abandonment of the Confession of Faith from those at least who avow that it enshrines the prejudices of a vanished age.

But is there not a hope that the boundaries of the Church of Scotland may be widened? It is for this hope's sake confessedly that Dr. Tulloch remains within the Church. In the most remarkable public and published expression of liberal thought yet given by any clergyman of the Church of Scotland, Dr. Tulloch declares that our State Churches must go if there is not some scope allowed to the power of free Christian thought "rooted to the truth—remember this limitation I have urged—rooted to the living truth, the love of God in Christ."

"And I am one of those—I confess it without any shame—that would rather see them go than I should see the impulses of Christian thought restrained. It is my own individual opinion; I commit no man to it. No man loves the Church of Scotland more than I do. I will make no parade of my feelings; but it is impossible for me to say how much I feel attached to it in many ways; but there is one thing I feel attached to more, and it is the right of a Christian man, in the light of God's Word, to search the truth for himself, and to declare the truth in the light of God's Word, and under the teaching of God's Spirit. It is for these ends that the Church is in existence. If it does not allow this freedom, I confess that the Church could have no interest for me, and I could not retain the affection for it which I now entertain. People talk of putting men out of the Church. It would not be hard to put me out of the Church in such a case. I would soon bid good-by to the Church if I was convinced with these men that a certain measure of freedom of inquiry was hopeless within it. I will not believe, even after what has happened, that it is hopeless. It is because I believe that it is not hopeless that I retain my position in it, and will retain it until I see my duty in some other way."*

Is there any hope that the Church of Scotland will admit the measure of freedom required?

* Speech of Dr. Tulloch, Edinburgh, June 6th, 1866.

The first fatal difficulty, to our mind, is, the necessity of subscription before a man can have a vote in the Church courts. We apprehend that while a certain proportion of young men, feeling in their early days the deeper stirrings of a religious life, and with their souls touched unto fine issues by the mighty word of prophecy, may dedicate themselves to the service of the Church and accept subscription as a professional necessity, having had no experience of the bitterness of the struggle between inward thought and outward profession, there will be an ever-increasing difficulty in the way of inducing the more cultured scholars of our universities to take upon themselves the yoke of bondage. A man already in the Church, under conditions accepted in his youth, is in a very different position from one about to enter it. Questions are becoming familiar to-day which press home upon every student, and bid him pause before he pledges himself for life to a system which his own teachers declare is pervaded with prejudices. If he resolve to speak openly, he will have to run the gauntlet of Church courts, and patrons will fear his name. If he be silent, how can he bear the burden of the text, *What ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops?* We believe, therefore, that there will be a steady deterioration in the quality of the students devoting themselves to the ministry the more plainly it becomes apparent that the Confession to be subscribed is at variance with the results of scientific criticism. Is it not simply honourable for a young man before he enters a Church which has legal standards, not only to decide for himself, but to make known during the trial discourses he has to pronounce, how far he can defend these standards? In entering upon any office of worldly profit, it would be his duty to declare how far he is ready to comply with its legal and moral obligations: is honour in the Church to be less sensitive than honour in the world?

There will also be another and greater difficulty in affecting the votes of the General Assembly. We do not believe Scotland to be a priest-ridden country, for the strength of the Church is the lay element which it admits into its councils. An alteration in the conditions of eldership would clear the way for the reform of the creed. But, as the matter stands, this can only be done by men who are already pledged. It is found more and more difficult to

obtain educated men as elders, because they will not sign the Confession. The very men whose presence is absolutely necessary for the doctrinal reform of the Church of Scotland, cannot comply with the only condition which will secure that end, and enter the eldership. A man of the world, in the honourable sense, cannot sign a document even for the purpose of ultimately urging his objections to such signature, and the very fact that he is opposed to subscription is the guarantee that he will not subscribe.

The development of a Broad-Church party within the General Assembly is, we believe, fatally checked by this practical difficulty, which prevents the liberal clergy from receiving the support of those very laymen who most heartily sympathize with them. In the Assembly of 1865, Dr. Lee brought forward a motion for the abolition of subscription on the part of elders, but it was at once negatived by an overwhelming majority.

Granting, however, the very opposite results to those we anticipate, and accepting the hope that the present majority in the Assembly may gradually be overcome, there still remains a difficulty which we believe to be absolutely insuperable. According to the Westminster Confession, "under the name of Holy Scripture or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testament, which are these" [a complete list follows]. It is also expressly and definitely declared that the Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek "are authentical, being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages." Liberty may be secured so long as Scotch theologians use such vague terms as "the Bible being rightly interpreted;" "we must permit science to assist in determining the true meaning of the Bible;" "reason and revelation cannot contradict each other," and so forth; but directly it is perceived that doctrines may be in the Bible which are not true, any struggle against the standards of the Church must become utterly hopeless. The nature of the Bible is the great question of the second Reformation; but upon this the decision of the Scottish Church is foreclosed. The authority of Scripture is to be received, not because it contains the Word of God, but because "it is the Word of God."* What is the best

* Confession of Faith, chap. i. 4.

freedom which can be won within the Church worth, when it thus necessarily excludes the whole range of modern Biblical scholarship? Some clergymen reconcile themselves to their bondage on the ground that the Confession itself lays down the principle that God alone is Lord of conscience, and hath left it free from those doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to His Word.* But the Bible is declared to *be* this Word of God; and thus the broadest liberty claimed is no liberty to investigate the nature of the Bible itself. On this ground, if on no other, there seems to us an insuperable barrier between the National Church and the free student of theology.

The addresses both of the Moderator of the Free Church and the Chairman of the Congregational Union dwell upon the same subject as that which we have been discussing, and justify the attention we ask to the controversy regarding ecclesiastical creeds as it is now waged in Scotland. Mr. Wilson asks the Assembly the question, which he describes as a very proper question to be put, whether it is free to ascertain and act out the Lord's will.

"On the contrary, do we not meet here under well-defined and severe restrictions, and these moreover of human imposition? If we have been set free from those limitations which a power standing outside of the Church imposes, have we not fastened a yoke upon ourselves, and imposed limitations upon our own liberty? Have we not our Forms of Process, and, above all, a Confession of Faith? And are we not bound, instead of looking directly into the perfect law of liberty, to guide our procedure and our declarations of truth by these human documents? Have we not thus entangled ourselves with a yoke of bondage which prevents us from walking in all the breadth of the Divine statutes? At such a time as this, when such questions are being agitated around us, it may not be inappropriate, however briefly, to furnish an answer to them. The questions really resolve themselves into one, which is this, What is the relation in which the Church stands to her Confession of Faith?"†

The reply given is remarkable. After stating that the Confession is a declaration, so far as it goes, of what has already been found in the Divine Word, the Moderator's address proceeds to point out that it only expresses the

* Chap. xx. 2.

† Proceedings of General Assembly of Free Church, May 24, 1866.

present faith of the Church, and can never be regarded as a permanent and final document.

“No Confession of Faith can ever be regarded by the Church as a final and permanent document. She must always vindicate her right to revise, to purge, to add to it. We claim no infallibility for it, or for ourselves who declare our belief in the propositions which it contains. We lie open always to the teaching of the Divine Spirit—nay, we believe in the progressive advancement of the Church into a more perfect knowledge of the truth. It is the Word of God only which abideth for ever. In the Bible we have a completed revelation, but we are slow of heart to apprehend all that God has taught us there, and the experiences and errors of the past, as well as the better materials now provided for an intelligent investigation of Scripture truth, may possibly advance the Church and the world to such a position that a protest against some exploded errors may no longer be necessary, and a fuller statement of some truth may be desirable. It is open to the Church at any time to say—‘We have obtained clearer light on one or other or all of the propositions contained in this Confession; we must review it; the time has come for us to frame a new bond of union with each other; a new testimony to the world.’ If this freedom do not belong to us, then indeed we are in bondage to our Confession, and renounce the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.”

If, we submit, this be the true position of the Church—if its members lie open to the teaching of the Divine Spirit, and believe in its progressive advancement into a more perfect knowledge of the truth, ought it not to allow within its borders liberty to study and doubt its existing standards? Otherwise how can the new truth be discovered? There can be no progressive advancement unless clergy and laity are not only permitted but encouraged to re-examine the recorded dogmas. If it be lawful (and the Moderator assures the Free Church that it is) for the Church to revise her Confession and adjust it to her present attainments and inquiries—nay, even altogether to abolish or dispense with a Confession—the great disgrace being, not in such proceedings, but in retaining what has ceased to be believed—then it must be lawful to conduct those preliminary inquiries without which it can never be decided whether the Confession is to be abolished or revised. It cannot be said that it is lawful for a man to walk, but not lawful for him

to use his muscles; liberty to move surely necessitates liberty to observe the absolutely essential conditions of motion.

The logical result of the principle laid down would be a justification of free inquiry in the Free Church of Scotland, —a result which we frankly admit the Moderator himself would be the first to oppose.

The Chairman of the Congregational Union of Scotland (the Rev. H. Batchelor) states at length the objections to authoritative and subscribed creeds.* Their imposition would appear to us, however, a merciful relief both to preacher and people, if they are to be rejected upon some of the grounds indicated, and to be replaced by the personal, private and irresponsible course of "earnest and uniform action" which Congregationalists are advised to arrange.

A creed is to be declarative and unsubscribed, not authoritative and subscribed, for the sake (among other reasons) of subjecting every candidate for ordination or recognition to a theological examination.

"I remark, in the next place, that a declarative and unsubscribed creed is more certain to present the actual conviction of the person whose opinions you desire to ascertain. When every candidate for ordination or recognition prepares his own confession of faith, it must be a very rare thing for a man to compose a deliberate lie, and detail what he really does not believe. But a man can adopt authoritative and subscribed creeds as a whole, without accepting definitively any article in particular. If you would know his personal beliefs, you must avoid all allusion to his creed. It provides no clue whatever to his doctrinal opinions. Subscription may mean something or nothing, as it happens. In the Anglican Church you learn a man's views, as sceptical, Popish, or evangelical, from private intercourse, or from such public utterances as he may be pleased to make them. The creed is a blank mask, through which the play of the features does not steal. All swear to the same book. You cannot conjecture the shade of doctrinal belief which any Presbyterian may derive from the standards to which all are pledged. The Presbyterian denomination to which a clergyman belongs is a more reliable indication of his dogmatical stand-point. But that is not certain, and will become less so. We prefer, and especially in a crucial period like our own, the primitive, natural, and direct method of obtaining a man's Christian beliefs from himself, rather than re-

* Inaugural Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Congregational Union of Scotland, held in Edinburgh, May 2, 1866. By Rev. H. Batchelor.

sorting to the circuitous, doubtful, and untrustworthy business of subscription.”*

Congregationalism in Scotland thus proposes to enfranchise the human mind from an enforced subscription, not for the high sake of independent thought, but for the purpose of cross-examining its ministers more minutely. There is a possible escape for the heretic through the meshes of a creed; the Thirty-nine Articles were never intended to provide logical toils to arrest the Latitudinarian. If Broad-Churchism penetrate Scotland, what will be done? But the heretic will hardly venture to compose a deliberate lie, if personally and directly challenged. Congregationalism, with the boast of freedom on its lips, really seeks to make the Church of God the house of a stricter bondage.

Mr. Batchelor urges certain duties which ought to be discharged in these days with peculiar watchfulness.

“We need to be especially careful neither to ordain nor recognize men in whose Christian state and Christian beliefs we have not an intelligent confidence. Only persons of blameless lives and orthodox opinions have been in the habit of entering our pastorates, almost as a matter of course. Extreme caution in the past generation was hardly necessary. But we are advancing into different circumstances, and we must guard ourselves with anxious circumspection and prayerful fidelity. Each minister who takes part in an ordination or recognition service has a personal and solemn responsibility to fulfil which he cannot transfer to another. He has no right to take anything for granted without information. In the future, no one amongst us ought to ordain or recognize a candidate without thorough inquiry and complete satisfaction. It is incumbent upon us to establish, as an inflexible usage, that every minister sharing an ordination or recognition should require a previous conference with the candidate, when at all practicable, and that in no instance should a minister take part in the service without first inspecting the confession which the candidate has to read in public. It is a grievous wrong to attempt to comply with so weighty and sacred an obligation without pondering what the candidate has to declare of the work of the Holy Spirit in his heart and life, and what he has been guided to accept of ‘the glorious gospel of the blessed God.’ We ought to be able, from our knowledge of the candidate, to repair to the solemn assembly with assured and hallowed satisfaction that God is with us. We, on whom the dread

* P. 21.

responsibility rests, ought to have nothing to learn when the candidate rises to avow his regenerate state before God, and his joyful adhesion to the 'truth as it is in Jesus.' Ministerial character and standing belong to God and the church; and we must employ them for the welfare of the church and the glory of God. If a brother asks me for the public influence which the grace of God has developed through my life and work, I am bound to demand,—What are you going to do with it? I must be persuaded that he is not about to pull down what I supplicate and labour to build up. Congregationalists have been too lax about these serious matters. It is high time that we arrange for earnest and uniform action."

Every Congregationalist minister thus becomes an inquisitor into the faith of his brother. No rule of public law is laid down for his guidance. He is bound by no determined method of just procedure, and his decision is subject to no review. Presbytery and Assembly assume no functions so arbitrary as those claimed for the minister of a Congregational church, for they at least accept a legal code, and those who submit to their jurisdiction do not forfeit their right to an open verdict upon evidence sifted by the moral rules of public justice.

"If any minister among us depart from the Gospel of Christ, it will be the duty of those who remain faithful to the truth to withdraw from him, and assign their reasons for doing so. My obligation to fraternise with a minister who seems to me to be doing the work of Christ, implies the co-relative obligation to separate from him when he appears to me to oppose the faith of the Lord Jesus. Such is the tenor of apostolic injunction and example. We can do no more; no less. Less we *dare* not do; more we would not do. For any one to pretend that one minister may not inquire into the Christian beliefs of another, as an interpretation of Congregationalism, is puerile, disingenuous, and something worse. It is moreover to ignore or to falsify our past history."

Congregationalism in Scotland is thus to be resolved into a system of espionage. Every minister becomes responsible for the faith of his neighbour, and sits in perpetual judgment upon it. We are drawing no unauthorized deduction of our own; six clergymen who were present at the service

held to recognize Mr. Cranbrook as pastor of the Albany-Street Church, Edinburgh, invited that gentleman to meet them in friendly conference, with the avowed object of ascertaining his views on some points of revealed truth, and in consequence of his manly refusal to submit to such an inquisitorial examination have suspended ministerial communion with him (27th March, 1866).

The Congregationalist is not only forbidden to hold (to use the phrase of these gentlemen) "views different from those hitherto held and taught in our churches," but on the mere rumour that such is the case he may be subjected by his brother ministers to a theological cross-examination. Nay more—the degradation is deeper than this; the simple refusal to submit to this self-constituted court of jurisdiction is an offence of so deep a dye as to justify immediate excommunication. If any man enter the Congregational ministry in Scotland, therefore, according to the doctrine of the Address "published by request of the Union," and the practice pursued in the case of Mr. Cranbrook, he surrenders his independence, not even to a church as a living and organic whole, but to any half-dozen individuals who may be present at his ordination.

For a man to endure such a position is to forfeit the nobleness which there may be, on the one hand, in devotion to a Church esteemed the veritable body of Christ, or, on the other, in the independence which would cast aside ecclesiastical authority and only admit responsibility to the living spirit of the Master.

Many of the special questions creating the greatest excitement in Scotland at the present day, are, it may be admitted, trivial compared with the problems which stir the depths of European thought. Whether the Free Church shall introduce into its services twenty-five Hymns in addition to the Psalms—whether a clergyman of the Established Church may use a book in which he has printed his prayer—the rival claims to authority of a Kirk session and a Presbytery—how far there is scriptural authority for the use of an organ—whether a train should run on Sunday between Glasgow and Edinburgh—are questions which, at first sight, appear to raise issues of a local and relative importance, and to furnish curiosities of thought rather than to be connected with any profound principles of theology.

They cannot, however, be so lightly dismissed. They indicate the direction of the Reformation, secretly but surely changing the thoughts of men in the most creed-bound churches. Many a noble cause has been fought out upon its side issues rather than its own merits; and those who ridicule the heat of controversy expended upon theological trifles, forget that, when men are devoutly in earnest, nothing can be trivial which is bound by any living tie of sympathy to the great contention of their souls. We cannot condemn as mere ignorant bigots those opposed to the very beginnings of innovation in Scottish churches. It is not the innovation itself, but the method of thought involved, which endangers the ancient landmarks. The debate, for example, on the Sabbath question has involved a general examination of the relationship of Judaism to Christianity and the foundations of moral law. It was contended, on the part of Dr. Macleod, that the Decalogue, as a Decalogue, is not binding on Christians. The Decalogue, as God's covenant with Israel, has been abrogated, while to the believer Christ is all in all. To a man living in the spirit and following Jesus, it would make no possible practical difference if he never saw the Ten Commandments. The whole argument of Dr. Macleod (which will constitute an epoch in the religious history of the country) leads to conclusions against which he warmly protests. If Christianity is to be separated from Judaism, so far as the continued obligation of the fourth commandment is concerned, by what logic can you retain any obligation of the Christian to receive Jewish science and history? The Decalogue not only contains a command which is not moral, but a distinct statement scientifically erroneous—"in six days the Lord made heaven and earth." If the Decalogue, as a Decalogue, was morally abrogated by Christ, so that in himself all God's moral law as a rule of life is summarily comprehended, is it not scientifically abrogated also; and must not faith in Jewish science cease to be demanded as a condition of Christian discipleship? Jewish history stands upon the same footing. If we have everything in Christ—if to be in Christ is to drink the waters of everlasting life—then faith in the science and history of the Pentateuch as an essential part of Christianity becomes as untenable as faith in Judaic ceremonialism. Upon this, as other points, departure from the old

traditionary view of the Sabbath, as given in the Confession, necessitates important doctrinal modifications.

One other point regarding this Sabbath controversy. The final result of the debate in the Glasgow Presbytery is given in the following minute :

"Dr. Macleod at the request of the Presbytery made a statement regarding his speech delivered on the 16th day of November last, and since published ; and having done so, *declared his adherence to the Confession of Faith as his confession of faith.*

"The Presbytery on hearing said statement are of opinion that his speech as a whole is rash and unguarded, and that various passages of it are susceptible of being interpreted as favouring doctrines inconsistent with the Confession of Faith ; that in consequence of this, and having regard to his statement now made, it is the duty of the Presbytery to admonish Dr. Macleod ; and that this finding be an admonition to him."

So far, however, as the very point at issue is concerned, the Westminster Confession of Faith is not the confession of Dr. Macleod's faith, as it is given in the authorized edition of his speech. The Confession of Faith describes the fourth commandment, for example, as a "positive, moral and perpetual commandment."* Dr. Macleod expressly says,† that he does not believe in the continued obligation of the fourth commandment, and affirms without doubt or offence that from its very nature it is not moral.

The Presbytery, in the face of this avowed divergence, which Dr. Macleod most honestly renders perfectly plain, draw up the minute quoted. Can there be a more striking comment on the strange ways subscription necessitates ? Dr. Macleod is felt to be too noble a Christian to be expelled, and the minute really accepts a general statement acknowledging the Confession, in spite of the assurance that liberty to differ from it is claimed on the sole question at issue,‡ while it tries to hide beneath vague language the actual breadth of its own toleration.

The reform of the Church of Scotland in the reverent order of its services is rapidly advancing. Organs are being built in many important districts, and although Dr. Lee's innovation of a prayer-book is not accepted beyond his own

* Chap. xxi. 7.

† P. 20.

‡ See Dr. Macleod's speech before quoted, p. 372.

church, and has not yet escaped through the meshes of the nets cast over it by ecclesiastical courts, there is no doubt that outward forms of prayer and praise are becoming more expressive of the hallowed calmness and the solemn hopes of a worshipful heart. The ecclesiastical state of the question of Innovations is at present this—an appeal on the part of Dr. Lee has been dismissed, and the Presbytery of Edinburgh has been instructed to inquire into the manner in which public worship has been conducted in his church, “and to take such steps as the result of the inquiry may shew to be requisite for the regulation of the service in said church, in a manner consistent with this deliverance and the law and usage of the Church.” What is the law of the Church is a debated matter, upon which Dr. Lee can answer for himself with wonderful ability, so that this decision will not conclude the struggle.

The great debates within the Free Church turn upon the question of union with the United Presbyterian Church, and upon the propriety of using Hymns, in addition to the metrical version of the Psalms, in the services of public worship.

The United Presbyterian has no doctrinal controversy with the Free Church ; but the Free Church still claims to be the National Church of Scotland, while the United Presbyterian Church adopts the voluntary principle and formally repudiates ecclesiastical connection with the State. As a matter of fact, neither Church has any support from the Government ; and the difference between a Church which would be established, if it could obtain terms which its most sanguine members can never expect will be granted, and for the attainment of which agitation has been long abandoned, and a Church which would not consent to be established upon any conditions, becomes so entirely theoretical that it will not long continue a barrier to union. An institution which would accept a grant of money if it were offered—but to which it is not offered, and never will be—is divided from an institution which would not accept it even if it had the chance, by the broad gulf of a great principle (as individuals contrasted by similar circumstances might have characters entirely antagonistic), but it is a gulf over which the astute leaders, who see in union an access of ecclesiastical power, will manage ultimately to build a sufficiently commodious bridge.

It will be a strange ending to a strange history when the Free Church, which almost as its first cry at the hour of its birth lifted up no uncertain voice against the voluntary principle, practically assumes the position of a body of Evangelical Dissenters. Union with United Presbyterianism is the virtual abandonment of its claim, in any sense whatever, to be the National Church. There has hitherto been a certain dignity in the pride of its demands. It has been like a prince claiming a rival's throne and using the high language of legitimate right. By the alliance proposed, however, the Free Church of Scotland becomes a Dissenting sect.

United Presbyterianism also, we believe, will lose in breadth of thought what it gains in ecclesiastical power. Its Church has had the reputation of a certain liberality, rather from the general tone of its teaching than from any special decisions of its courts. It has attached to itself many cultured laymen who reject the authority of an Establishment, and have little sympathy with the severe doctrinal restrictions of its rival. One of the avowed motives, however, guiding the chief supporters of the proposed union, is the power it will give to secure a stricter orthodoxy within its boundaries. Dr. Buchanan (the foremost representative in the West of the Free Church) complains that if a member be excluded from the one Church, he can obtain acceptance easily within the other, and recommends union as securing more effective discipline. By union, the Church is to be kept closer to its old Calvinistic theology, and to be secured from any chance of "putting itself on the inclined plane of Broad Churchism." The Church will speak (it is said) with more potential voice on all such questions as the sanctity of the Sabbath and the divine authority and inspiration of the Bible, while a common declaration upon the Atonement, protesting against prevailing errors, is already suggested as an appropriate method of celebrating the accomplished work.

Are the liberal men of the United Presbyterian community content to hand over the definition of their creed to this new court? Let them take warning. To issue declarative statements is to add a Confession to a Confession. At present it is at least free to each man to read the Westminster Confession by the light of his own conscience. Let the union be accomplished in the method proposed, and the

United Presbyterian will have to read his creed in the light of that majority of votes which will undoubtedly be possessed by the Free Church.

It is supposed by its advocates that the Union movement cannot be viewed with complacency or satisfaction by the Established Church. We venture to submit that the Establishment has everything to gain, and nothing to lose, by the accomplishment of this union; and will be greatly strengthened, instead of being (to use Dr. Buchanan's expression) visibly dwarfed in the eyes of the whole community.

A policy which reduces the Free Church into the position of a Dissenting body, and will attempt to rivet more tightly the links of a doctrinal yoke, at once places the Establishment in the field, without a rival to its claim to be the inclusive Church of the nation. We believe that, in consequence of the union, liberal men will seek a refuge within her borders, which they will not have in United Presbyterianism, from the moment its independent individuality is absorbed in the numerical superiority of its present ally and future master. A National Church must, by the necessities of its existence, be to some extent a Broad Church; and if the religious organization of Scotland, outside of its borders, be avowedly opposed to Broad Churchism, those thinkers and scholars who have found a worse bondage where they expected a better freedom, will return to their ancestral fold.

The large majority in the Assembly in favour of the Report submitted by the Committee on Union, renders its accomplishment simply a matter of time. It may take a few years more or less to adjust the terms, but practically the question is decided. One difficulty only has arisen of any threatening character, which is both curious and instructive. The Free Church proposes to unite only with the United Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. The United Presbyterians have many English churches associated with them, and are unwilling that their fellowship should be severed. The truth is, that the United Presbyterian Church in England is not opposed to the use of organs, which the Free Church persists in esteeming Popish and unscriptural. In England, also, there is another atmosphere of thought—men of diverse minds associate more freely—and it is felt essential to keep Scottish theology free from southern influences, or its peculiar characteristics may be lost.

The great problem of brotherly Christian fellowship is not affected by these discussions now going on in Scotland. The basis sought is one of doctrinal agreement and not spiritual unity. The suggestion that some of the fathers of the United Presbyterian Church tolerated heresy on the Atonement is warmly repudiated on every side. Ambitious pictures are drawn of a powerful organization opposing the errors of the age. There is no recognition even of the Christianity which would unite those whose intellects diverge in common worship through the living sympathies of the devout heart.

The warmth of the discussion on the use of hymns will hardly be intelligible in England. Practically we agree with Dr. Begg and Dr. Gibson, that it will be a great misfortune for the Free Church to introduce hymns into its services, although from a directly opposite reason. The hymns selected will undoubtedly contain the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement in their rudest forms, whereas the Psalms can only "by implication" be understood to refer to Christ in the Calvinistic sense, and the metrical version is free from the coarser language of mediæval theology. It is one of the curiosities of theology that the actual sympathies of a Unitarian should be on the side of the extremest Calvinists of the Church. Theoretically, however, it is astonishing that a Christian Church should prefer words descriptive of the pomp of an Eastern monarch, the garments of his attendants and the gold upon his throne, as expressing the beauty of the Master's holiness, to the noble poems of Milton, Cowper, Wesley and Keble.

Theology in Scotland is so earnestly pursued, that the position of the minor sects is full of interest. Upon these, however, we cannot venture in our present article. We believe the Westminster Confession to be so definite in its form, and subscription so binding in its terms, while the action of ecclesiastical courts is so decisive and so prompt, that it will prove ultimately impossible to broaden any existing organization wide enough to admit frankly and freely the claims of modern scholarship. The whole course of thought and feeling in Scotland is rapidly tending to divide men more sharply into two hostile camps; and those who receive the ancient standards, and those who are discontented with them, are ranging themselves gradually on either side. Scotland

is on the eve of struggles as intense as any in her past history. Prosecutions for heresy have already begun ; and the growth of a free Christian literature will be the occasion for debates on far deeper questions than any yet raised in our ecclesiastical courts. When once it shall be fairly decided by vote of the Assembly that there is no legal ground in any Scottish Church adopting the Westminster Confession for those who occupy a position similar to that of the English authors of "Essays and Reviews" (and we believe it must eventually be so decided), our hope is that a Non-subscribing Church will arise, in which theology will be studied as a science, with no restrictions save those implied in the love of truth, and that sweet spirit of Christian union cherished, which doctrinal divergence only intensifies and renders more subtle and more divine.

HENRY W. CROSSKEY.

IV.—ERNEST RENAN—LES APOTRES.

Histoire des Origines du Christianisme, Livre Deuxieme.
Les Apôtres. Par Ernest Renan, Membre de l'Institut.

WE can feel nothing but sympathy with the object of the able author of "*L'histoire des Origines du Christianisme*." His aim, as it seems to us, is to shew that the way for a mission such as that of Jesus was prepared by a long course of events, and that the time had come for the spread of monotheism on a wider basis than the Jewish ; he desires to contemplate from a philosophical and historical point of view those events which the sacred writers could not but consider under the over-mastering consciousness of their own great spiritual change. And as a thorough examination of the characters and the documents on which the Christianity, we may almost say the Religion, of the world depends, is in these later years first possible, so is it most necessary. The steady march of thought has brought to many of us difficulties which we have in no degree made for ourselves ; it has also in some measure brought to us the means of resolving them. The Bible is understood more distinctly than in days past not to be a homogeneous whole,

and even the separate books of which it is composed often fall into many portions under the disintegrating processes of modern criticism. And so can more clearly be seen the gaps, the inconsistencies, the contradictions, which they present historically, even if we are brought nearer to certain of the more important facts. The Gospels especially have fared in these late years somewhat as a valuable picture in the hands of an intelligent dealer. So long as this hung in no very strong light, and was seen at respectful distance, it was held for the authentic portrait of some distinguished person by the great artist whose name it traditionally bore. But examined, it proves to be only by a painter of his school, possibly drawn from recollection or earlier portraits, and not from life; it has been patched and re-varnished before, and though far from devoid of historical value, men are not afterwards able to say with absolute certainty, thus and no otherwise looked and was he whose lineaments are figured here. The difficulty of such certainty is indefinitely increased if several such likenesses are found, all differing in some essential features; yet the probability that they are not mere fancy portraits is strengthened, should they all present the same type of person in the same character of dress, and with somewhat similar and marked accessories.

Every one who reads his Bible intelligently is obliged to form for himself some ideal likeness of Christ which does not wholly agree with that presented by any one evangelist, for the simple reason that they do not agree with each other, is obliged in like manner to frame some theory of the constitution and acts of the early Church, and fill up the slight sketch presented in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. What all in these days must do informally, many have done and are doing formally. There is in such an attempt neither orthodoxy nor unorthodoxy, Catholicism or heresy, for it may be and is made by either side. How widely felt is the need of some such reconstruction, how little necessary connection it has with doctrine or discipline, is shewn in the fact that the author of *Ecce Homo* has been claimed by dogmatists and non-dogmatists, has been said to be almost every clever or well-known person between such opposite poles as Dr. Newman and the writer of *Adam Bede*.

Neither are we without deep sympathy with M. Renan

in many of the attacks made on him for the spirit in which he has performed his task. He has endeavoured to divest himself of all pre-conceived opinions, to write fairly and faithfully. He has anatomized Christianity, that if possible he may discover the true principle of its being ; he has taken off the wrappings, and striven even to examine, as it were, that sacred form which once was laid in the garden-tomb. In so doing, he has laid hands on much which should be touched discreetly and reverently, but on nothing which should not be handled at all. Not all are called on to do as he has done, not all have nerve and coolness and faith in the usefulness of their aim ; but as in the dissection of the human frame, to which we have compared his work, it were a very feminine and trivial thing to say with Ida in "The Princess," that all who study anatomy,

"— in the dark dissolving human heart
And holy secrets of this microcosm,
Dabbling a shameless hand with shameful jest,
Encarnalize their spirits ;"

so were it equally trivial and untrue to say that all who examine the origins of Christianity do so to mock, or rise from the investigation worse men than when they begun. The greater and diviner the subject, the better will it bear a close scrutiny, which is rendered needful by circumstances beyond our choosing and our will. M. Renan has also, like ourselves, a strong dislike of proselytism ; he feels that if conversion to any opinions is to have value, it must be because it is effected from within, not from without ; he knows that he has written in the cause of truth, and believes that truth alone is what he desires should prevail. His words on this point are touching and dignified, and not the less so because they shew that on that height of supreme indifference to which he conceives he has attained, he carries with him a tender human frame, able to be affected by the currents of air which rise from the level plains below. He says :

"What end should I propose to myself in writing these works ? One only ; to find the truth and give it life, to labour so that the great deeds of the past should be known with the greatest exactness possible, and put forth in a manner worthy of them. The thought of shaking the faith of any one is far from me. Works such as these should be executed with the utmost impar-

tiality, as though they were written for a desert planet. Every concession to scruples of a lower kind is unfaithfulness to the worship of art and truth.”*

And if proselytism is a mistake, so also is persecution. We can only wonder alike at the taste and the tactics of such as on either side of ancient and modern thought condescend to the imputation of low motives, insinuate that a faith other than their own implies greater laxity of morals, or bring to bear on holders of alien creeds those social or spiritual excommunications, which, of no serious importance in themselves, may, like the stings of noxious insects, cause more discomfort than graver trials. If we are orthodox, it is well that M. Renan should remind us of an “invisible Church, which includes excommunicated saints,” that “a Church casts out its elect;” if heretical, we may remember with him that “the heretic of to-day is the orthodox believer of the future,” and not be too angry with those in whose position we may find ourselves sooner than we are aware, in this quickly moving and rapidly thinking age. But having said thus much, and keeping before us the dread of the only excommunication which has terrors for M. Renan or for us—“The Father which is in heaven excommunicates none but such as are of a dry spirit and a narrow heart”—we cannot approach the examination of the volume before us without pointing out an essential disagreement between the writer and ourselves in a matter where Englishmen of all shades of opinion are wont to feel very strongly.

In spite of his admiration for the character of Jesus, he allowed himself to admit, without one shadow of proof, that in the matter of the raising of Lazarus, Jesus was at the least cognizant of a pious fraud, done to increase his own authority. He did not seem aware that such want of common honesty would vitiate all the religion and spirituality in Jesus, and reduce him to the rank of a mere charlatan, such as neither has founded or can found a creed or church capable of making any deep impression on humanity. He did not recognize that divine morality which is anterior to and the basis of all religion. Many readers of the “*Vie de Jesus*,” who were not shocked at the previous departures from technical orthodoxy, who in the main were disposed to

eliminate so much as was possible of what is called miraculous from the history handed down to us, who felt that the account of the life in Galilee, painted though it was in too roseate colour, had in it much of new truth, were as much offended here as the most rigid believers, feeling that there was revealed an absence of the power of realizing the true beauty of that most holy life, and decided that, whatever might be the difficulties of that strange occurrence, known only to the writer of the fourth Gospel, M. Renan's way out of them was that which they would most absolutely reject. The whole passage revealed a warp, as it were, in the mind of an earnest seeker after *truth*, who should surely before all things recognize the supreme importance of that he seeks. Since he found, as he thought, this blemish in the character of Jesus, and was not deeply moved, nor suffered it to detract from the general estimate he had formed of his holiness, it is with the less surprise, though with great regret, that we find M. Renan deliberately advise dishonesty in the case of those who are set to lead their fellows in the paths of righteousness, and are, justly or not, looked on by the majority in all churches as officially learned in theology. The following is the passage which stirs us out of all critical calm:—

“The spirit bloweth where it listeth, and the spirit is liberty. But there are those rivetted, as it were, to an absolute faith, I mean men engaged in holy orders, or clothed with a pastoral ministry. Even then a fine spirit can find the way of deliverance. A worthy country priest comes, by his solitary studies and by the purity of his life, to see the impossibilities of literal dogmatism; must he then make sad those whom up to that moment he has consoled, and explain to simple people changes which they are quite unable to understand? God forbid! There are no two men in the world who have exactly the same duties. Good Bishop Colenso, in writing down his doubts the moment they occurred to him, has performed an act of honesty such as the Church has not seen since its beginning. But the humble Catholic priest, in a country whose spirit is narrow and timid, should be silent. Oh, how many discreet tombs round village churches thus hide poetic reserves, and a silence as of angels! Will they whose duty it has been to speak, equal the merit of those secret ones known to God alone?”*

tiality, as though they were written for a desert planet. Every concession to scruples of a lower kind is unfaithfulness to the worship of art and truth.”*

And if proselytism is a mistake, so also is persecution. We can only wonder alike at the taste and the tactics of such as on either side of ancient and modern thought condescend to the imputation of low motives, insinuate that a faith other than their own implies greater laxity of morals, or bring to bear on holders of alien creeds those social or spiritual excommunications, which, of no serious importance in themselves, may, like the stings of noxious insects, cause more discomfort than graver trials. If we are orthodox, it is well that M. Renan should remind us of an “invisible Church, which includes excommunicated saints,” that “a Church casts out its elect;” if heretical, we may remember with him that “the heretic of to-day is the orthodox believer of the future,” and not be too angry with those in whose position we may find ourselves sooner than we are aware, in this quickly moving and rapidly thinking age. But having said thus much, and keeping before us the dread of the only excommunication which has terrors for M. Renan or for us—“The Father which is in heaven excommunicates none but such as are of a dry spirit and a narrow heart”—we cannot approach the examination of the volume before us without pointing out an essential disagreement between the writer and ourselves in a matter where Englishmen of all shades of opinion are wont to feel very strongly.

In spite of his admiration for the character of Jesus, he allowed himself to admit, without one shadow of proof, that in the matter of the raising of Lazarus, Jesus was at least cognizant of a pious fraud, and to increase his authority. He did not seem aware that such a want of common honesty would vitiate all that he said in Jesus, and reduce him to the level of a man such as neither has founded a religion nor is capable of making any. He did not recognize that Jesus was the basis of all that he said of Jesus,” who were not technical orthodox

[illegible]

We trust that the beauty of the words in which it is couched will conceal from none the profound immorality of this passage. If there be one duty more sacred than another, more binding on the clergy of all dogmatic churches who shall find that their own convictions are not those which their people think them to be, or which they seem bound to hold, it is, that they should explain their views, and in what way they are tenable with the words placed in their mouths and the acts they are bound to fulfil,—such as the service of the Mass in the case of the Catholic priest,—or else that they should cease to minister as heretofore they have done. Here, of course, as in every other turn of life, is much room for questions of casuistry,—how and how often such explanations should be made, how detailed or how general: there is the danger also of leading others to believe that the faith which needs explaining differs more widely than it really does from received opinions, the danger too of unsettling other men's views without giving them better; but these dangers and questions have to be met in other matters also; they do not affect the broad principle which we, in common with all Englishmen, affirm, and which M. Renan here denies, that as in other things, so in theology, honest truth-speaking is better than dishonest silence. If it be true, as he says, that "the harmony of humanity results from the free emission of the most discordant notes," it is yet certain that no harmony can result from notes that will not speak, or that give another than their natural tone.

And now let us escape from this subject to those in which, if we differ from M. Renan, it is on matters of criticism and opinion, not of morals.

The point at which the "*Vie de Jesus*" ended was significant of the spirit in which the present volume would commence. To the evangelists, to the multitude of Christian believers whose faith is founded on those four narratives, the burial of Jesus was in no sense the concluding scene of the majestic transactions of which he in his flesh, a living man, was the central figure. That which is here so well called "*la vie d'outre tombe*," was and is to them as essential, as real a part of the *life*, as the years spent in the carpenter's cottage, the months by the shores of Galilee, the last sad days in Jerusalem. But to M. Renan the events of

the first Easter day, important as they were, were founded on delusion, if not imposture, and the Resurrection is not a fact in the history of Christ, but a mistake, important as though it had been fact, in the history of the Church. The documents of the New Testament with which "*Les Apôtres*" are co-extensive are therefore the concluding chapters of each of the evangelists, together with the opening part of the Acts of the Apostles, to the end of the fourth verse of the thirteenth chapter. These may be supplemented by a few passages in St. Paul's Epistles, so far as the events of his own life immediately after his conversion are concerned, and by the Apocalypse, so far as it gives a picture of that Roman world in which and by means of which Christianity was to become the Catholic Church. The time occupied in the book is about twelve years, from A.D. 33 to A.D. 45, the probable date of St. Paul's earliest mission, and the main subjects of interest divide into three groups, of which the Resurrection is the centre of one, the descent of the Holy Ghost of the second, the severance of the Church from the Synagogue, in the giving and acceptance of the name Christian, of the third. It is abundantly clear that the *history* of the Christian Church here begins to emerge from the somewhat chaotic state in which all histories, sacred as well as profane, are destined to pass the first stages of their existence; that in the precedent narrative there are gaps which can only be filled by intelligent conjecture; and that the fragmentary form of much of the narratives invites very searching criticism.

The value of the latter chapters of the Gospels is touched but slightly in "*Les Apôtres*." The fourth Gospel is still, as in the "*Vie de Jesus*," set above the Synoptics as an historical authority; and herein M. Renan, as he is aware, differs widely from most able critics. He has reconsidered the whole subject, and been unable to modify his former conclusion, promising to give reasons for this persistence in the Appendix to a new edition of the "*Vie de Jesus*." We will therefore only say this much, that all harmonies of the accounts of the Resurrection signally fail. But in so failing, the discrepancies which remain only serve to give a more life-like picture than could be gained in any other way of the confusion, the cross reports, the incoherences of statement on the part of those who were engaged in the trans-

actions of that memorable day. And out of them there arises most distinctly and definitely the impression that no mere phantom created by the imagination of Mary Magdalene, or some other, moved among the disciples, but a living, palpable man, however some recorded facts, such as the words to Mary Magdalene, seem to militate against the supposition. We do not undervalue the enormous difficulties of the received account, or forget the suggestions which have been made, that the death of Jesus was no real death, that the person who appeared was other than he, that the whole story of the Resurrection was a growth of after years: each of these in turn is open to at least equal objections with the received account; but of this we are quite sure, that no attempt hitherto made to explain the basis of all historical Christianity is so absolutely incredible as that which is here presented to us.

We are required to believe that *in one day* a creed without any foundation in fact, without any previous expectation which should lead to it, grew from its dim beginnings to full maturity; that the natural instinct of nations which refuses to believe that its greatest men are dead, so worked on the small personal following of an individual, that these in a moment, as it were, effected the work of generations. We are reminded that the Jews thought that Enoch and Elijah had not tasted death, and that strange tales were abroad of the patriarchs of old as living and breathing yet in their sepulchre at Hebron. Such a belief, as it was anterior to the Resurrection, so when it has recurred since the Resurrection has been quite independent of it. The expectation in Germany that Friederich Barbarossa, in England that the fabled Arthur, should return in the hour of their country's sorest need, and the like, is the expression of the yearning desire of a nation in after times for a deliverer, and the tendency of the people to give that abstract desire a concrete form. But no band of friends who laid one, however dear or great, in the tomb, looked to legends such as these as the ground of an actual resuscitation. Even those whose faith in a resurrection is most defined, pass long days or weeks before they can think of anything beyond the fact of death and their own great loss. These, however, are the thoughts which are supposed to pass through the minds of the disciples on the day which followed the first Good Friday.

"All handiwork was forbidden because of the Sabbath. But never was rest more fruitful. The Christian consciousness had on that day one only object, the Master who was laid in the tomb. The women especially covered him in spirit with their tenderest caresses. Their thoughts did not leave for an instant that sweet friend, laid in the myrrh, whom the wicked ones had slain. Ah! no doubt the angels surround him, and veil their faces in his winding-sheet. Well said he that he would die, that his death would be the salvation of the sinner, and that he would live again in the kingdom of his Father. Yes, he will live again; God will not leave His Son a prey to hell, or permit that His elect should see corruption! What matters that stone of the tomb which weighs upon him? He will raise it, he will mount up again to the right hand of his Father, whence he came down. And we shall see him still, we shall hear his charming voice, we shall enjoy his conversations once more, and it is in vain that they have killed him."*

For all this we need scarcely say there is not a shadow of foundation in the Gospels; the telling quotation from the Psalms was first used, as it would seem, after the fact of the Resurrection was a matter of current belief; there is no trace of anything but the honours paid to one whose voice was for ever silent. But we must pass on to the account of the vision of Mary Magdalene, and the skilful touches by which M. Renan strives to make his strange hypothesis plausible. When at her coming she found the tomb empty and the body gone, "the idea of the Resurrection was yet but little developed in her mind." There is nothing but the baseless words quoted above to shew that *any* such idea had ever entered her mind. The account given in the fourth Gospel is then followed pretty closely till we come to this passage, in which the italics are our own.

"A sort of instinctive movement draws her to kiss his feet. The *light vision* withdraws, and says to her, 'Touch me not.' *Little by little* the shade disappeared. But the miracle of love is accomplished. What Cephas could not do, Mary has done; she has known how to draw life and words sweet and penetrating from the empty tomb. . . . *Wild with love, intoxicated with joy*, Mary re-entered the city. And to the first of the disciples whom she met, said, 'I have seen him, he has spoken to me.' Her greatly perturbed imagination, her interrupted and incoherent

speech, caused some to suppose her insane. Peter and John on their part relate what they have seen. Other disciples go to the grave and see the same. The fixed conviction of all this first group was that Jesus had risen from the dead. Many doubts still remained; but the assurance of Mary, of Peter, of John, imposed upon the rest. Later this was called the vision of Peter. Paul in particular does not speak of the vision of Mary, and gives to Peter all the honour of the first apparition. But this expression is very inexact. Peter saw only the empty tomb, the napkin and the winding-sheet. Mary alone loved enough to go beyond nature, and cause to re-live the phantom of the admirable Master (*du maître exquis*). In these sort of wonderful crises, it is nothing to see after others; the whole merit is to see first, for others at once model their vision on the received type. It is the part of delicate organizations to conceive an image promptly, rightly, and by a kind of innate sense of design. Thus the glory of the Resurrection belongs to Mary of Magdala. After Jesus, Mary has done the most for the foundation of Christianity. *The shade created by the delicate senses of the Magdalen wanders yet on the earth.* Queen and patron saint of idealists, the Magdalen has known better than any other how to confirm her dream, and to impose upon all men the vision of her impassioned soul. Her declaration, so great and so feminine, 'He is risen,' has been the basis of the faith of humanity. Avaunt, powerless reason! Apply not a cold analysis to this masterpiece of idealism and love. If wisdom gives up the task of consoling this poor human race, betrayed by fate, let folly try her hand (*laisse la folie tenter l'aventure*). Where is the sage who has given such joy to the world as Mary of Magdala the possessed one?"*

Now let it be remembered that M. Renan assumes as completely proven one of the most uncertain minor points in the Gospels. He makes no doubt that Mary Magdalene out of whom went seven devils, and the woman "who was a sinner," are one and the same, and that her sin was prostitution. More than this, he extends the same qualities to others who ministered to Jesus. We hear of "those women, so touching in their possession, those women who were sinners converted, true foundresses of Christianity, Mary of Magdala, Mary Cleophas, Joanna and Susanna."† And again: "No more Sermons on the Mount, no more possessed ones healed, no more courtezans touched, no more of those strange fellow-labourers (*collaboratrices*) in the work of redemption, whom Jesus had not repulsed."‡

* Pp. 11—13.

† P. 32.

‡ P. 55.

We are to believe, then, that the faith of the world has depended on the hallucinations of a few half-mad women ; that the central fact of Christianity, on which St. Paul says hung the whole system which he taught, was based not even on a spiritual reality which in course of time crystallized into material fact, but the "delicate senses" of courtezans. And as we go further, we find a suspicion that the hallucinations were but half honest, and the sensations not too delicate to admit of fraud. For what in the mean time had become of the body of Jesus? Had the Jews taken him away, or the proprietor of the garden, "who was according to all likelihood," but not according to the Gospel of St. Matthew, "a stranger to the sect"?

"But indeed the grave-clothes left in the cave, and the napkin folded carefully apart in a corner, scarcely accord with such an hypothesis. This last circumstance leads us to suppose that the hand of a woman had been there. We think involuntarily of Mary of Bethany, who indeed has no part allotted to her on the Sunday morning. The five stories of the visit of the women to the tomb are so confused and so embarrassed, that we may well suppose they conceal some misunderstanding. The feminine conscience under the dominion of passion is capable of the strangest illusions. It is often the accomplice of its own dreams. To bring about those kinds of incidents considered as marvellous, no one deliberately deceives, but everybody, without intending it, is brought to connive at deceit. Mary of Magdala had been, according to the language of the time, possessed by seven devils. In all this we must take account of the little precision of mind in Eastern women, their absolute want of education, and the particular cast of their earnestness. Exalted conviction renders impossible all self-examination. Whoever sees heaven everywhere is sometimes tempted to put himself in the place of heaven."*

The whole band of disciples of Jesus caught, we are told, from the women this "intense fever," in which visions multiplied, and a breath of air seemed to whisper the word "peace," a sign that the risen Jesus was among them. In this state of exaltation they returned to Galilee, and there took place that strange event which has given rise to the final dogma connected with the earthly life of Jesus. A spectre like that of the Brocken passed in the clouds across the mountains, and seemed to send them away to preach

* Pp. 42, 43.
2 E 2

faith in him who thus vanished from their adoring gaze.* We have condensed the account which M. Renan has given, but we think we have done him no injustice. In no degree can we accept his explanation, or the mode in which he fills up the gaps in the history. The world was not converted by means of a woman, to whom, if all that is here said be true, the Maid of Orleans was sane, and Joanna Southcote honest.

If, indeed, the whole story of the Resurrection can only be understood spiritually, if all belief in the literal account be given up, then after a time may those who find themselves forced to hold such conviction attain to see that the letter killeth and the spirit giveth life; but the passage from the one faith to the other must be in most men attended by keen pangs of sorrow, and for awhile the hopelessness of utter unbelief. To few is it given to accept with calm assent an explanation which degrades the material fact, and makes the spiritual frivolous and childish. The feeling so touchingly expressed in the following lines is far healthier, sad as it is, and far more manly.

“Weep not beside the tomb,
 Ye women, unto whom
 He was great solace while ye tended Him;
 Ye who with napkin o’er the head,
 And folds of linen round each wounded limb,
 Laid out the Sacred Dead;
 And thou that bar’st Him in thy wondering womb;
 Yea, daughters of Jerusalem, depart;
 Bind up as best ye may your own sad bleeding heart:
 Go to your homes, your living children tend,
 Your earthly spouses love,
 Set your affections *not* on things above,
 Which moth and rust corrupt, which quickliest come to end;
 Or pray, if pray ye must, and pray, if pray ye can,
 For death, since dead is He whom ye deemed more than man,
 Who is not risen; no—
 But lies and moulders low;
 Who is not risen!

* * * * *

And, oh, good men of ages yet to be!
 Who shall believe *because* ye did not see—
 Oh, be ye warned, be wise!

No more with pleading eyes,
 And sobs of strong desire,
 Unto the empty, vacant void aspire,
 Seeking another and impossible birth
 That is not of your own and only mother earth ;
 But if there is no other life for you,
 Sit down and be content, since this must even do :
 He is not risen !
 * * * * *

Here, on our Easter Day,
 We rise, we come, and lo ! we find Him not,
 Gardener nor other on the sacred spot :
 Where they have laid Him there is none to say ;
 No sound, nor in, nor out—no word
 Of where to seek the dead or meet the living Lord ;
 There is no glistening of an angel's wings,
 There is no voice of heavenly clear behest ;
 Let us go hence, and think upon these things
 In silence, which is best ;
 Is He not risen ? No,
 But lies and moulders low !
 Christ is not risen ! " *

So far the biographers of Jesus have been our guides, and, spite of contrarieties in their mode of relating facts, we have far more likelihood of forming for ourselves some clear vision of what took place than when we are reduced to the testimony of one only. This one, the author of the Acts of the Apostles, is beyond all doubt the author of the third Gospel, of which his second treatise is a continuation. Neither has the opinion that he was a disciple and companion of St. Paul been seriously impugned ; the very journeys during which he attended that apostle can perhaps be discovered from the passages in which the writer adopts or discards the use of the first person ; there is no reason for rejecting the universal tradition that he was Lucas or Lucanus, and he may very likely have been, as M. Renan considers, of Philippi, a Roman colony.

" He knows little about Judaism and the affairs of Palestine, is scarcely acquainted with Hebrew, but is versed in all the affairs of the Pagan world, and writes Greek in a fairly correct style. The work was composed far from Judea, for people who knew its geography ill, and did not care about accurate rabbinical science,

* A. H. Clough—Remains. Printed for private circulation.

or for Hebrew names. The leading idea of the author is, that if the people had been free to follow their inclinations, they would have embraced the faith of Jesus, and that the Jewish aristocracy hindered them. The word Jew has always a bad meaning with him, and is used to signify an enemy of the Christians. On the other hand, he shews himself very favourable to the heretical Samaritans."*

To this, with which in the main we agree, we may add, that his tendencies were communistic (compare his account of the Sermon on the Mount with that given by St. Matthew); that he had a very deep feeling for the outward appliances of religion, but little strong dogmatism; would rather make light of differences in the early church, than bring them into prominence. M. Renan places the date of the book late, about the year 80, and if, as seems likely enough, it were written at Rome, if it be true, and we think it is, that "the author seems to avoid all which could wound the Romans,"† then the reason for breaking off the narrative where it ceases is quite plain, then the strongly marked ecclesiasticism of the treatise has its reason, the growth of the tree having declared the nature of the germ. Both his works are written for the same person, and, except so far as he was St. Paul's companion, he makes no claim to any *personal* knowledge of the events he relates. Indeed, in the third verse of the first chapter of his Gospel he speaks of himself as having "traced out accurately (*παρακολουθῶ*) all things from the beginning." His aim was before all things to group and systematize his narrative, and make it a consistent whole, to be effective rather than accurate, dramatic rather than historical. The speeches in the Acts are instances of this dramatic faculty. Written as they must have been for, and not as spoken by, the characters, they are all wonderfully in keeping with the conception of that character presented to us, though not always with our own view of it as drawn from other sources. The tone towards Paganism, for instance, in the speeches at Lystra and on Areopagus, while quite in keeping with the tone of St. Paul in the Acts, is wholly different from that in the Epistle to the Romans. The one authentic speech, of which St. Luke may have had notes or recollection, probably the latter, seems to be that of St. Paul before Agrippa. It is the only one

* Pp. xviii; xix.

† P. xxii.

that resembles the Epistles in being at once digressive and continuous, i.e. carrying on an argument steadily through very abrupt changes of form. And this will quite tally with the fact that it is one of the few speeches of very great moment at which St. Luke, if he were the "we" of the Acts, may have been present. The late date of the Epistle, the possible nationality of St. Luke, the time in St. Paul's life at which their careers joined, will account for much that has seemed singular to readers of the Acts. There is no real strangeness in the want of allusion to the Epistles. Why should there be?—since St. Luke could not know that they would get bound up with his own narratives for all future ages. Again, if St. Paul's conversion took place A.D. 35, and his earliest meeting with St. Luke was in Troas A.D. 53, the discrepancy between the narrative in the Acts of the circumstances after St. Paul's conversion and his own account in the Epistle to the Galatians, is easy to understand. Save when need required, the apostle had other things to do than talk about his earlier life, and probably had neither time nor taste for the minute details of that time of spiritual agony. Nor is there any reason to believe that St. Luke formed any idea of writing his narrative till after he was separated from his Master. What do we really know of the way in which those with whom we are now most closely associated spent their lives eighteen years ago? Yet were any of them of such importance to the Church of our time as was St. Paul to his, no doubt there would be varying accounts of the events of those years, one of which, did we come to write a book, we should have to adopt; and we should certainly take that which most agreed with our own impressions of what would have been, but by no means, so certainly that which did happen. And thus also will be explained the difference in the character of the two portions of the book,—the one based on hearsay, adopted by a mind at once systematic and receptive, not to say credulous,—the other, a narrative of what he had seen and known,—the whole welded together under the sense of a need of coherence, and with considerable dramatic power. On the fundamental distinction between the two portions, M. Renan says,

"With regard to its historic value, the book of the Acts is divided into two parts; the one, comprising the first twelve chap-

ters, and relating the principal facts of the history of the primitive Church ; the other, containing the sixteen remaining chapters, all devoted to the missionary journeys of St. Paul. But even this second part includes two kinds of narrative—on the one side, those in which the narrator gives himself as an eye-witness ; on the other, those where he only relates what he has been told. It is clear that even in this latter case, his authority is great. * * * Towards the close the narrative becomes wonderfully precise. The last pages of the Acts are the only completely historical pages which we possess on the origin of Christianity. The first, on the contrary, are the most open to attack of any in the New Testament.”*

But having said all this, and much more to the same purpose, it is not a little strange to find these very first chapters adduced as testimony throughout “*Les Apôtres*,” as if their trustworthiness had never been impugned. It appears to us that, on M. Renan’s principles, a detailed and accurate history of the first years of the Christian Church is simply impossible, and it were far better to admit the fact, however to be regretted, than build a house on sand, against which he himself has turned a rushing flood. This is one of the inconsistencies of criticism which make men distrust all modern research, and turn impatiently away from books like the present, in which, despite these blemishes, there is much that is useful and true, as well as fair and plausible.

For the second division of our subject, that of which the descent of the Holy Ghost is the central fact, the Acts of the Apostles is our only guide. It presents to us the company of disciples waiting in Jerusalem for they knew not what, but trusting and rejoicing. The women who thronged around the grave are mentioned collectively ; we find the former company of the eleven,—Judas’ place being soon filled by Matthias,—Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren. These were the Church—these, all at least who are mentioned by name, had been the chosen companions of the Master who was gone. He had done much to form them, but he had chosen them, as all men choose their friends, because he saw in them something which responded to his own high nature ; we cannot think that even he who had fallen was all vile when Jesus called him. M. Renan, how-

* Pp. xxvi, xxvii.

ever, has by no means a high opinion of the apostolic college. He says,

"We shall understand better how great Jesus was, when we shall have seen how little were his disciples. * * * They were as little, narrow, ignorant, inexperienced, as it is possible to be. Their mental simplicity was extreme, their credulity knew no bounds. But they had one quality; they loved their Master to madness. The memory of Jesus remained the only moving power of their life; it haunted them perpetually (*c'était une obsession perpétuelle*); it was clear that they would live only on him who for two or three years had so strongly attached and attracted them. For souls of the second rank, who cannot love God directly—who cannot, that is, of themselves find truth, create beauty, do good, their safety is to love some one in whom there shines a reflection of truth, beauty and good. The great majority of men needs a worship at second-hand. The crowd of adorers desire one who shall come between themselves and God."*

That the world has grown older since apostolic days, and in some respects knows much more, is a self-evident proposition; but we cannot admit that in spiritual matters the men of Jesus' choice were "of the second order," or unworthy his companionship. Some noble souls there surely were in Judea and in Galilee, and though into that band there was received a traitor, the majority were, and must have been, above the common crowd. Every one, even Jesus, must work with such instruments as he can gain; but in choosing some and rejecting others, it were no sign of strength or greatness, but the reverse, to choose the less worthy. The proverb, "*Noscitur a sociis*," has even here its truth, and to lower the standard of the disciples of Jesus is to dwarf him also. It is not true, to begin with, that "the women" were as a mass all that M. Renan would have us believe; the Virgin Mother, the beloved disciple and St. Peter, of whom we know most, were not mere compounds of prejudice and ignorance and superstition, because they were not critical in their applications of Scripture, and did not sift strange occurrences till they had eliminated all action on the part of God. And surely we are not required to take a low estimate of their mental condition because in and among them ecstatic and prophetic phenomena soon sprung up. For the history of the religions of the world

* Pp. 56, 57.

goes far to prove that ecstasy and its accompanying circumstances are developed at the commencement of all religious movements, however great or however contemptible, if indeed it can be said that any religious movement is contemptible. To assert that because the early Christians saw visions and dreamed dreams, spoke with tongues and prophesied, *therefore* they were credulous and weak, is to ignore the vast part which mystics and mysticism have played in the religion of every age, to reduce into the second rank such souls as St. Paul and Luther, St. Francis Xavier and Edward Irving. That the development of such phenomena was the central fact of the nascent Church, which gave it a catholic character, cannot be denied ; for we find from St. Paul's Epistles that they soon had taken their place among the regular signs of a Church, and nothing less than a sense of its enormous importance can have led the Church to invest the Spirit which filled it, with a distinct personality, and raise it, as well as the Master they had lost, into a co-equality and co-partnership with the Eternal Father. A community in spiritual gifts, both ecstatic and moral, was the link which bound together the members of that Church, which could not but grow, in great measure, through the influence of these very gifts.

But though we have regarded as thus important the Descent of the Spirit, and the first meeting at which the strange phenomena took definite form, we do not care to discuss their nature at any length. For, considering them as in no degree different in kind from those which occurred in the schools of the prophets in the Old Testament, or from those which have so often re-appeared in the Church, —looking further on all of truth which there may be at the root of modern spiritualism and mesmeric manifestations, as also of the same nature, we cannot but feel that this is part of a far larger subject, and one of which the first principles are even now scarce defined. We would only say, that much on the subject in "*Les Apôtres*" is well worth attentive study, in spite of the somewhat undue prominence, as we think, which is given to the more emotional part of the subject, the feminine gift of tears, and the "chaste melancholy" of the Church's earliest days.

As we pass on to consider what was the outward organization of the infant Church, we cannot but regret that we

are dependent on the testimony of one only, and he no eye-witness. We cannot think that M. Renan or any other will ever succeed in reproducing a portraiture of that strange time. That the faithful in Jerusalem continued to worship in the temple, that the "breaking of bread" as Jesus had broken it developed very soon into distinct eucharistic service, that baptism, as an initiatory rite, was used as soon as it was needed, there can be no doubt, from external as well as internal testimony; but the organized communism, the developed diaconate, the sisterhoods, seem to belong, the one to an unrealized ideal in the writer's mind, the others far more to the state of things existing A.D. 80, than to that before the death of Stephen. What we mean is in part expressed by the following paragraph:

"That the author of the Acts, to whom we owe the picture of this first Christianity at Jerusalem, has somewhat forced the colours, and in particular exaggerated the community of goods which reigned there, is certainly possible. The author of the Acts is the same as the author of the third Gospel, who in the life of Jesus is accustomed to transform facts according to his theories, and in whom the tendency to the doctrines of Ebionitism, that is to say absolute poverty, is often very marked. Nevertheless, the narrative of the Acts cannot here be deprived of all foundation. Even if Jesus pronounced none of the communistic maxims which we read in the third Gospel, it is certain that the renunciation of this world's goods, and almsgiving pushed to the stripping of self, is in entire conformity with the spirit of his preaching."*

But we should feel inclined rather to say that when St. Luke wrote, he himself having been adopted into the Christian Church from a Roman colony, and having come in contact with the diversities in teaching of St. Paul and St. Peter, Christianity already seemed so inclusive and so great, that each man read into it his own desires and opinions, each man already appealed to antiquity for the origin of that which seemed to him best and truest in the system of which he was himself a part. Nor must it be forgotten that in the absence of periodical literature, when communication is difficult; or when times are stirring and thought is active, still more when these two conditions coincide, men live fast in thirty years, and are at a greater distance

* Pp. 77, 78.

from their own youth than others in days of peace and easy communication are from those generations which have long slumbered in the grave.

For dogma, only two points seem to have stood out from Jewish teaching with absolute clearness, but they were of the highest importance. These were, that Jesus was the Messiah who should restore all things, and that the generation which heard him should not pass away till he re-appeared. And till such expectation relaxed its tension, what need was there of books? How certain it was that tradition would vary!

The first distinctly historical occurrence connecting the embryo Church with its great future career, arose from the vigorous preaching of the former of these doctrines. And, as is generally the case, the zealous maintainer of this opinion was a convert, not one who had grown up through companionship with Jesus into faith in him. Stephen, described as one of the deacons, seems to have been a simple proselyte, or at most one of the Hellenistic Jews. He it was who, for having maintained the thesis that Jesus was Christ, was brought before the Sanhedrim, condemned to death, and stoned. Such a proceeding was of course most irregular as regards Roman law, under which the Jews then were, though accompanied by all due formalities according to the law of Moses. But the Roman authority was lax at this time in Judæa; Pilate was or was now about to be recalled, and it was part of the then policy to look with indulgence on Jewish proceedings. This sudden and tumultuous execution was the real, though not the proximate, cause of the conversion of St. Paul. It is true he never speaks of it in his Epistles; it is true that the address on the castle staircase at Jerusalem was, as we think, written for him by St. Luke. But at least it was written by one who knew well what he would be likely to say, and the words in which he is made to touch on the death of Stephen are too solemn and too vivid not to contain a record of the way in which the apostle, when deeply moved, would speak of that tragedy. The vehemence with which the persecution of the rising sect was at once carried on by Saul, is what would naturally take place in an earnest man trying to stifle those rising convictions which were to give a different colour to his whole after-life. His soul ripened for its change, even

when it seemed so changeless, till any outward event might cause his old husk to fall off, and bring the new man to light. How this event was brought about we will let M. Renan tell, premising that his version of the facts is one which, on the whole, commends itself to us.

"If Paul there" (in the lovely and fertile plain of Damascus, a paradise of God) "met with terrible visions, it was because he bore them in his own spirit. Each step which bore him towards Damascus woke in him the most poignant perplexities. The odious part of executioner which he was about to play became insupportable to him. The houses he began to see were perhaps those of his victims. This thought haunted him, slackened his steps; he would not advance, he fancied himself to be resisting the pressure of a goad. The fatigue of his journey, joined to this pre-occupation, overwhelmed him. His eyes, as it appears, were inflamed, perhaps with the commencement of ophthalmia. In these prolonged marches, the last hours are the most dangerous. All the weakening causes of the past days are accumulated in them, the nervous force fails, and a reaction sets in. Perhaps also the sudden passing out of the plain scorched by the sun, to the fresh shade of the gardens, brought about a crisis in the unhealthy and shattered organization of the fanatical traveller. Dangerous fevers, accompanied by delirium, are in these latitudes sudden in their attack. In a few moments persons are, as it were, thunderstruck. When the attack is over, the impression left is that of profound darkness, traversed by flashes of lightning, or of figures seen against a black ground. It is certain that a terrible shock deprived Paul in a moment of what distinct consciousness remained to him, and cast him to the ground insensible.

"It is impossible, with the narratives which we have of this strange event, to say if any exterior fact brought about the crisis. . . . In such cases the exterior fact is of little consequence. . . . For my part, I much prefer the hypothesis of a fact personal to Paul, and felt by him alone. Yet it is not unlikely that a storm suddenly broke out. The spurs of Mount Hermon are a point for the formation of thunder-storms unequalled in violence. . . . For the Jews the thunder was always the voice of God, the lightning the fire of God. Paul was under the influence of the strongest excitement. It was natural that he should lend to the voice of the storm what was in his own heart."*

Thus, in the conversion of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, ended that second drama of the great trilogy contained

* Pp. 178—181.

in "*Les Apôtres*." The Holy Ghost had come on the church, had gone beyond its first limits, and brought into the fold Jews and Greeks alike ; but on none had it descended with so great power, nowhere was a vessel more fit to hold it and pour it forth on others, than he who was, as he afterwards believed, sanctified to this end from his mother's womb, and baptized with the dread baptism of the proto-martyr's blood.

It is remarkable that almost as soon as St. Luke has narrated the conversion of St. Paul and the events which followed, he takes up again the story of St. Peter, and relates two circumstances, both in the same episode of his life, neither of which we should have anticipated. These are his stay at Joppa in the house of Simon the tanner, and the baptism by him of Cornelius at Cæsarea. The residence with one who followed an impure trade, and the ready acquiescence in the admission to the Church of those who did not come through the gate of Judaism, seem grouped here, as though to make light of the great differences which existed between the schools of thought represented by St. Peter and St. Paul. But however the close prejudices of the Jewish school were broken down, whether by vision or by force of circumstances, the spirit of Christ was now fairly abroad on the world, and sooner or later a severance must come between the Synagogue and the Christian Church. Jerusalem was no place for the abiding sojourn of new converts. The Christ they knew was not the Christ who had been Jesus of Galilee, but was in part the creation of their own imagination ; a religion at second-hand could not satisfy such a soul as that of St. Paul ; needs must that he, however unconsciously, should in great measure become the author of the faith he spread, and the holy city was no fit place for the rapid development of new ideas.

It is the tendency of our age to do justice to unrecognized worth ; but this tendency is one which easily becomes paradoxical, and leads men to disregard, on the one hand, tradition as of no value—on the other, to be unfair to established reputations for the sake of new favourites. M. Renan shares this tendency, carrying it so far as to express a sincere regret that materials are wanting out of which he might endeavour to rehabilitate Simon Magus ; he has, as we have seen, greatly magnified the part of Mary Magdalene in the first.

days of the Church ; he sacrifices St. Paul in some degree to his admiration for St. Barnabas, to whom "Christianity has been unjust, in not placing him in the front rank among its founders."

"All great and good ideas have Barnabas for their patron. * * At Antioch a magnificent idea sprung up in this great heart. Paul was at Tarsus, in a repose, which for a man active as he was must have been a punishment. His false position, his stubbornness, his exaggerated pretensions, annulled a part of his good qualities. He fretted himself, and remained almost useless. Barnabas knew how to set to its true work that force which consumed itself in an unhealthy and dangerous solitude. A second time he extended his hand to Paul, and brought back this wild character to the society of his brethren whom he wished to avoid. He went himself to Tarsus, sought him out and brought him to Antioch. To gain this great, shrinking, susceptible soul, was what those obstinate old men at Jerusalem had been unable to do."*

This and more is surely much to spin out of the simple words, "Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus for to seek Saul, and when he had found him he brought him unto Antioch."

It was under the ministration of these two men, of whom we must still consider St. Paul the greater and the leader, that the name Christian was formed. We make one last extract, which leaves nothing to say on this important crisis.

"It is a solemn hour when a new creation receives its name, for the name is the definite sign of existence. It is by the name that an individual or collective being becomes itself, and springs out of another. The formation of the word 'Christian' thus marks the precise date at which the Church of Jesus was separated from Judaism. For a long time to come the two religions will be confounded, but this confusion will only take place in those countries where the increase of Christianity is, if I may say so, less advanced (*arriérée*). The sect, moreover, soon accepted the appellation which was made for it, and considered it as a title of honour. When we consider that ten years after the death of Jesus, his religion has already a name in the Latin and in the Greek language in the capital of Syria, we are astonished at the progress made in so short a time. Christianity is completely detached from the womb of its mother ; the true thought of Jesus has triumphed over the indecision of his first disciples ; the

Church of Jerusalem is left behind ; the Aramæan tongue, which Jesus spoke, is unknown to a portion of his school ; Christianity speaks Greek ; it is definitely launched into the great whirlwind of the Greek and Roman world, from which it will never again emerge."*

And here we must draw towards an end. There is much else in the book to which we would fain have asked our readers' attention ; there is still somewhat we could have desired to combat. The whole question of miracles is dismissed more summarily than is quite fair to a question of such grave difficulty, while the term miracle is yet undefined. We could have wished to quote largely from and analyze the whole chapter on "The Condition of the World towards the Middle of the First Century," a masterly and satisfactory sketch of that condition of society which made a Catholic religion possible. But our readers will study this for themselves, and we owe them perhaps an apology for quoting so largely in our own indifferent English that which they will read in M. Renan's beautiful French. But we have been bound to quote when we would dispute, and sometimes when we would praise. It is the duty of a critic to differ more widely in details than he would be inclined to do on the whole scope and character of the work.

But whether we differ or agree, M. Renan and we both think that truth can only be reached by discussion, by full and fair inquiry. We have felt strongly, we have spoken strongly, yet we trust not to have exceeded the language of courteous criticism, or fallen into that reviling of which M. Renan has such reason to complain. Controversy is that which, be it said to our shame, tempts us all to be uncharitable, therefore unfair ; and the critic as well as the reader of criticism will do well ever to keep before him Faber's golden words, in describing the character of a loving, kindly man—"He has either not seen his neighbour's faults, or, when he saw them, the sight had to reach him through so much sunshine of his own, that they did not strike him so much as faults to blame, but rather as reasons for a deeper and a tenderer love."†

C. KEGAN PAUL.

* Pp. 235, 236.

† Spiritual Conferences, p. 315.

V.—W. J. FOX.

Memorial Edition of Collected Works of W. J. Fox. Vols. I, II, III, VII. and VIII. London: Charles Fox ; Trübner and Co. 1865.

THIS publication has been properly deemed the most becoming memento of the invaluable services rendered by William Johnson Fox to social and political progress, and especially to that freedom of inquiry in religion which he ever regarded as a *duty* inseparable from the *right* of private judgment. Its appearance is an invitation to glance at the writings and to study the character of the remarkable man whose portraiture they present to our reflections.

Looking over the multitudinous topics which are treated of in this collection, the difficulty has been felt of arranging Mr. Fox's opinions under classified heads. Among them, fluctuations or contradictions might probably be discovered and exhibited, if it were our business to encourage a habit which is too much the practice of the day, and taunt a man with changes of convictions the avowal of which is often most creditable to the courage and the honesty of those who are willing to confess that they have learnt something from reflection and experience. *Nolumus Leges Angliæ mutari*, may have been a very becoming protest for the Barons of Runnymede; "In this faith I will live, and in this faith I will die," has been the honoured utterance of many a martyr; but in days when fierce controversy agitates the world, no man is justified in closing his eyes or stopping his ears to the revelations of the wise and the instructions of the good.

It has seemed on the whole most desirable and practicable, in turning over the pages of these volumes, to record some of the impressions they have made, and to adopt a somewhat desultory manner of conveying a few reflections on their varied contents, instead of attempting to present an orderly and arranged survey of the whole.

The collection is as yet incomplete, for there remain to be published the Anti-Corn-Law Speeches, the series of Letters in the Weekly Dispatch signed Publicola, those of the Norwich Weaver Boy, Addresses on Educational Topics, and a volume of Lectures in Illustration and Defence of his Religious Opinions. They contain a considerable mass of

criticism, literary, musical and dramatic, besides such gatherings as may be accessible from the notes the author left, or in the fragmentary memoranda made from his extemporaneous preaching. So multifarious a harvesting will probably afford some future opportunity of taking a more comprehensive view of the action and the influence of one of the most distinguished labourers in the field of progress, and of doing more justice to his toils and services.

There is perhaps no one essay or discourse in this collection which was not worth preserving, for there is none without passages of power and pathos; yet there are so many grades of merit, such varieties of character in the composition, that it may be doubted whether a judicious selection from the whole might not have better served the great interests of truth; and high though the present volumes will raise the reputation of the author, it would probably have been raised higher had their number been more restricted. For it was impossible that the same mind, treating the same subjects and working with the same materials, should not frequently repeat itself. There is much—there must be much—in discourses on special occasions, in sermons directed to a passing purpose, which can only have a transitory interest. Something of a fragmentary character is visible in this large collection, which shews less of the philosophic mind constantly drawing its deductions from great, well-grounded and out-reasoned principles, than of that generous sympathy, that outpouring of uppermost emotions which are attractive from their impassioned sincerity in their immediate utterance, but which lose much of their effect when time and distance bring a calmer estimate of their value.

In turning over the pages of these volumes, so many are the passages characterized by beauty of style, felicity of expression, and novelty, if not always of conception, yet ever rich in illustration and adorning, that we feel it would be impossible even by multitudinous extracts to do full justice to the fecundity and fertility of the mind of the writer. And be it remembered that his early education was limited and imperfect; that in his boyhood he had access to few books and held intercourse with few superior minds; that in the period of his life in which as a student in the Homerton Academy he had access to the greatest

amount of instruction, that instruction could hardly be deemed of a highly elevated character, and was associated with a narrow theology and a sectarian school. To profound erudition, to any acquaintance with the less accessible sources of literature, he never put forward any claim. Few men were better read in the varied, but more especially the imaginative, productions of the British press. He held Wordsworth in high reverence, and was among the very first to recognize the profound philosophy to which our Poet Laureate has given the charms of the sweetest harmony. Mr. Fox has set in his coronal many a foreign gem which he polished and brightened by his own hand ; and if the flowers he presents have grown in other gardens than his own, he groups and garlands them with a charming artistic and peculiar grace.

It would be useless now to speculate as to what Mr. Fox would have himself suppressed, what he would have modified, what he would have retained, had he in his later days superintended the revision of his works. They are, however, pregnant with instruction, as representing the phases of thought, always honest, always eloquent, which for the time had mastery in his mind. It would have been gratifying in some respects, disappointing in others, if his latest convictions had found their full expression—disappointing, it were better said, to some ; for there are those too deeply interested in, too strongly attached to, the truths, the dogmas which they hold to be divine, to see without pain, and often without animadversion, those wanderings which in their judgment penetrate too far into the boundless field of inquiry. But we must resign ourselves to a paramount necessity ; we cannot stop, if we would, the flights of the strong wing, the investigations of the bold, the untameable mind. Whatever restraints we may put upon our own doubts and difficulties, no man, no body of men, can arrest the questionings, the probings, the explorings which agitate the world. They are not confined to home, they are not confined to Christendom ; there is a general heaving on all the ocean of thought. Everywhere the several orthodoxies are running about with their fetters—everywhere the “strong intellects” are escaping from thralldom.

Some of the phraseology and many of the terms of older opinions linger among Mr. Fox’s discourses. In the lecture

on Antichrist, the fall of man is distinctly portrayed as the "triumphant and extensive prevalence of natural and moral evil in the conflict with human virtue and happiness, the fading of the sunshine into darkness."* So, again, the dawn of the new creation, the moral world of Christianity, is represented as a scene of surpassing loveliness, without any reference to the ignorance and the errors which were associated with the earliest history of the teachers of our religion. The progressive and expansive character of Christianity, that plastic virtue by which, like all true philosophy, it can accommodate itself to the development and revelations of science, an ennobling view to which Dr. Channing has given the most emphatic expression, is much less discoverable in the earlier than in the later representations of our author. No doubt it is one of the high duties of reformers to remove the corruptions by which the simplicity and beauty of normal truths have been adulterated, but the religion of highly civilized ages must be of nobler tone and type than that which would satisfy ignorant or half-informed generations, and the great struggle which is now going on in the world is where and how to find a religion worthy of all the acceptance of advanced and educated minds. Orthodoxy insists on dragging the intellect down to the low level of its dogmas, and its wildest dream is that heavy denunciations will sink it by their momentum to the abyss of contented darkness; the very pressure has produced the rebound; the high-built dykes have only raised the level of the overflowing waters; and the demands of authority and infallibility have produced a reaction which, like surging cataracts, not only carry away masses of prejudice and error, but destroy much that is fair and fruitful, and which will have to be restored hereafter. Many of the interpretations of Scripture presented in these volumes would scarcely be accepted now, nor indeed do they present themselves as the results of erudite criticism. It was long after their appearance that the writer had visited the field of German theology, and then only through the medium of such works as had found their way to English literature by translations or quotation.

It has been said, and said with some justice, that the

writings of Fox exhibit less of creative than of destructive power—that he was more successful in overthrowing the bulwarks of the enemy than in the erection of fortifications for his own defence. It may be so. The old ruins must be removed, the ground must be made clear for new foundations. The mission of the present generation would seem more manifestly to be the rooting up of ancient weeds, and the preparation of the ground for better harvests. Doubt and scepticism have not yet done their work. Sir Isaac Newton thought that pure religion would enter through the portal of unbelief. The vibration of the pendulum of controversy will depend on the momentum it receives from the mass of errors with which it breaks away and is driven to the other side, and these vibrations will only agitate it until it shall settle into the quietude of recognized truth.

Whatever there may be wanting, or whatever superfluous, in Fox's writings, there is nothing inconsistent, or rather everything is in perfect harmony, with the two great fundamentals of religious truth—the universal Fatherhood of God, the universal Brotherhood of Man. The piety is always elevated, the charity always benign. Sometimes there is an outbreak of “the hate of hate,” “the scorn of scorn;” but “the love of love” is the more prominent, the more present passion.

“Our warfare is with systems, not with persons; to the most mistaking man alive we owe a brother's affections, to his errors nothing. . . . The calumny, the anathema, the penalty, the dungeon, are weapons which we leave to others, and only leave because we cannot wrest them from their grasp, to break and bury in oblivion.”*

Then, again, his religious teachings are characterized by a hopeful, happy, joyous spirit. His reading of Watts was an improvement. Instead of

“Religion never was designed
To make our pleasures less;”

he preferred,

“Religion ever was designed
Our pleasures to increase.”

It will be our purpose, in following the course of Mr. Fox in his religious and political career, to allow him to be the exponent of his own opinions. It would be impossible,

* III. 30, 31.

without quotations which would require hundreds of pages, to present the variety and many-sidedness of his views, and all the vivacity of that imagination which illustrated and enforced them; but the general tone, temper and tendency of his mind may be well gathered from the fragments selected. He is less remarkable for the originality of his conceptions than for the ornaments which his creative fancy supplied to the great outlines drawn by high and highest intellects. It may now and then be discovered that the richness of a too poetical shadowing was thrown around a somewhat mean and unworthy substance, and that a fascination of style was given to recommend a subject or an object scarcely worthy of such distinction. Not that Mr. Fox's language is ever cloudy or misty, but that in a rich exuberance of thought and an overflow of emotions the waters do not always inundate productive regions. Every sower wastes some portion of the seeds he scatters; every teacher has his utterances which bring no response. In the realms of thought, as in those of action, the important inquiry is, What is the balance between truth and error, between good and evil? And to truth, as to good, Mr. Fox has brought a great contribution. He has left the world, to use an eulogium which is now happily almost commonplace, but it is a grand eulogium notwithstanding—he left the world better than he found it.

There is a general character pervading the whole of Mr. Fox's writings, and it would not be easy to select any portion which failed to represent the characteristics of his tongue and pen. A sagacious Frenchman has asserted that in all literary works "the style is the man;" and there is no more marked exemplification of the truth of the theory than is to be found in the works of our author. Though full of point and antithesis, there is little of labour or of artifice in the preparation; it is not the result of an enforced, uneasy impulse, but of a natural and spontaneous outpouring. The energetic thought finds an energetic but most easy and natural expression.

Fox's early literary efforts are markedly of a combative and aggressive character. He had felt the heaviness of the chains of orthodoxy, and broke them with the rebound of an indignant impulse. The excited zeal of new converts has often been observed. It is but the natural reaction of

thought upon thought. There is generally a certain amount of passion in the breaking away from ancient habits of mind. That mind seeks the support of an unwonted courage to maintain and fortify a novel position, and welcomes the opportunity of giving evidence that the change is honest while it is decided. In the development of Fox's nature, the emotions and passions became less excited and emphatic, and the reflections and reasonings more grave and expansive. It is but an ordinary process that the judgment should be ripened and the passions cooled under the pressure of years. Perhaps, too, the position occupied by Mr. Fox in the private as the public field led to a more particular cultivation of his intellectual powers.

Mr. Fox never loses an opportunity of recognizing and hailing that religious progress, evidenced in the workings of his own thoughts, which, having its source in free inquiry, is the noblest characteristic, as it is the greatest theological virtue, of our times. In the influences of representative government, in the extension of popular education, in the elevation of labour, in the abolition of slavery, in the ever-increasing power of the press, he sees auxiliaries for advancing the good work, constantly calling upon us for zealous co-operation, and reminding us of our responsibilities while he encourages our exertions. We find him escaping from the regions of controversy about words, into the more attractive and more prolific fields of active beneficence. He feels impatient in the thought that "the meaning of phrases may be debated for ever," while the removal of misery and the production of happiness are the great concerns of man. He shews that civilization imposes new, more various, more noble duties upon society than were dreamed of in ancient time; that the expansion of the sphere of duty calls into activity more generous, more philanthropic affections, than were ever taught by philosophers of old, or exercised by any of their followers; that the true conversion of the soul is to be sought in the influence of that divine law which is perfect. He lays down the principle that the teachings of religion, like those of every other science, are constantly receiving new additions, new developments, new revelations. Hence the cultivation of the intellect is a religious privilege and a religious duty. The perfection of Christianity is certainly not to be found

in creeds called Christian, which are boundaries to inquiry, limitations to that knowledge which human dogmatism has no privilege or power to "cramp, cabin or confine." The faith in which ignorance rests contented will outgrow the narrow bonds of ignorance, and accommodate itself to the higher demands of philosophical investigation. It allows to no man, to no body of men, a monopoly of right interpretation, but welcomes, come from whence it will or from whom it may, whatever tends to elevate our conceptions of God, and to give more efficiency to our labours for the permanent good of man. If the facts of science are of divine origin, assuredly those which bring us into more intimate communion with the Godhead are most divinely divine; and of all the "foul forgeries" which disgrace the annals of bigotry, those are the worst which denounce damnation upon all inquiries which do not result in a foregone conclusion, insisted upon as absolutely necessary to salvation. In how much a higher, nobler class we stand as elements in that ever-growing progress, "the process of ages"—we, the successors of millions who have lived and are not, the progenitors of millions who are to be! "Revelation gives the clue to man's universal destiny: it unfolds his past, his future history. It is the book of humanity. There finds philosophy its truths, and philanthropy its motives. There we see something of the springs of this great machinery and of its tendencies. There we behold evil working out good, confusion generating harmony, and God's plans moving on to the display of his glory in the felicity of his creatures." One passage in these Sermons mirrors emphatically the minglings of the political, social and religious feelings in the mind of the writer. This impelling progress "makes the martyrs of one age, the patriots of another, the philanthropists of a third. Had Paul written at one period of our history, he would have said, Resist the Stuarts—at another, Abolish the Slave-trade—at another, Emancipate the Catholics." "There is no precept like a great principle wrought into the mind, the heart, the life."

In the same style, rising from the lower to the higher topics, in the sermon on Probation and Judgment he traces the two topics of his discourse from the nursery to the school, from the school to the social circle, from the world of teaching to the world of business, and then old age,—

and then, all analogies leading on to the contemplation of that great futurity when all the gatherings which probation has collected on earth will be submitted for the final judgment in heaven.

To the use of the term Unitarian, Mr. Fox always attached a large and liberal meaning. In fact, as a mere contradiction to a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, it had little value in his mind. To him it represented the whole field of Christian truth as far as regarded the attributes of the Deity; and were it associated with the highest views of God, it might be considered to embrace all the grander truths of the gospel; for from the perfections of God, the filial dependence, the universal brotherhood, of man might be deduced, with all the obligations, moral and religious, which emanate from such positions. But men in general have never consented to such an interpretation, or rather to such a commentary. The world has chosen to connect with Unitarianism ideas repulsive and not attractive to their theology. What Unitarianism rejects, and not what Unitarianism accepts, has become the ground of controversy. It was said by Mr. Belsham that Unitarianism is that portion of all Christian creeds in which all Christians agree. But the position would be maintained with difficulty; and we are launched upon the wide inquiry, What is Christianity, and who are Christians?—and there are few enlightened minds which would allow that question to be decided by any but themselves and for themselves. From the moment a line is drawn, or attempted to be drawn, separations and distinctions of a character repugnant to the claims of free thought must be the result; for though there may be marked contrasts, as in the belief of the Trinity or the Unity of the Godhead, there are certain modes of Unity which Trinitarians would accept, and certain forms of Trinity which would not be repugnant to Unitarian feeling, at all events to the feeling of many Unitarians. Language is not so precise as to give to every word from every mouth and from every pen exactly the same value; and it would be as easy to draw the line between the many colours of the rainbow, and to say, Here the red begins, and there the orange ends, as to mark the diversities of thought which pervade all reflecting intellects. Authority no doubt endeavours to do this; but it is against *authority* that the world is in rebellion. Bentham was wont to extend

the Baconian apophthegm by saying, "Let authority be barren as a mule, let experience be prolific as a rabbit."

There are germs of thought of the highest value in many of these discourses, such as will furnish excellent materials for more elaborate amplifications. In the sermons on the Christian Mission, it is ingeniously pointed out that one source of erroneous conclusions may be traced to our inability to distinguish the natural from the supernatural,—that our contrasted notions of the laws of Providence and the names we give to the recorded events of history, do not necessarily involve an interruption or disturbance of that order and harmony which must be the result of perfect wisdom, power and goodness. Hence a practical and tolerant conclusion that "the reluctance of some to admit such a thing as a miracle, and the horror of others at those who doubt miracles," are but exaggerated estimates of the importance and of the difference of conclusions at which various minds arrive. There may be a higher, all-embracing code of natural law admitting of irregular combinations in some of its subordinate details. In the same sermon he appears too soon to have pronounced the work of demolition done, and that of construction fully entered on. Is it so? Has discussion made such a *tabula rasa* by the removal of the rubbish of error, that the temple of truth is so rising in stately majesty as to be universally or generally recognized? Can we quietly turn "away from the contemplation of that we denounce to that which we believe"? Can we avoid "the conflict" with orthodox resistance, and plant our banners on fields we have not yet conquered from the enemy? Mr. Fox's volumes certainly prove that he considered his own mission to be not less the overthrow of obnoxious doctrines than the establishment of glorious verities. He lays down as "evident," that the truths of revelation in an earlier age become the truths of reason in a subsequent age—that supernatural facts in the process of time are the subjects of natural demonstration. But will the sceptical controversialist admit the premisses, admit that the existence of the revelation or of the fact in question may be taken for granted? If theological discussions, like the demonstrations of mathematics, could be made dependent on axioms which nobody doubts and everybody is willing to recognize, the advocates of different opinions might proceed

a great way in harmony together. A few generations ago, the voice of Chillingworth uttered a sound which had an echo through the Protestant world—"The Bible, the Bible is our religion!" But another phase of inquiry comes on, and the question is asked, "What mean you by the Bible?" and then again divergences and dissensions break out, and we can only come to the conclusion that the unity of divine truth remains, whatever may be the perplexities and perversities of human interpretation. Teachers like Mr. Fox bring noble contributions to the intellectual and religious treasury, and open the portals to others to come in with their offerings. New explorations, profounder studies, grander discoveries, have been constantly added to our stores of truth and knowledge; but it is with singular satisfaction that, in turning over these pages, we recollect the impression made by their first utterances, and acknowledge how truly worthy they were to make such an impression, even when viewed from the higher positions to which religious polemics have now been raised.

One whole volume is occupied by forty sermons on Christ and Christianity, first published in 1823. Their average length scarcely exceeds eight pages. The three most accordant with the now prevailing current of opinion are, "The Progressive Character of the Gospel,"—progressive not only from its growing influence, but from its expansive character, "its power to accommodate itself to, and to keep pace with, the general improvement of mankind."* "It is not too much for one generation and too little for another generation. It displays itself to each as if for that generation it was originally and peculiarly and exclusively designed; and yet it goes beyond each, and impels each forward; and another and another age succeeds, with no nearer approach towards the sounding of its depths, the exhaustion of its stores, or the attainment of its elevation. The world never outgrows the gospel. As no progress has ever yet made it obsolete, none ever will."† And then he proceeds in a series of apt illustrations to exhibit its influence upon childhood and upon manhood, upon the lower and the higher intelligences. "From the beautiful similitudes of the lily's glory and the sparrow's flight which delight the eye of the

* II. 183.

† II. 183, 184.

child and touch the heart of the untaught man, up to the lordly intellects which will not be allowed to weep because there are not more worlds to conquer—their minds are kingly mansions in which Christianity dwells, just as she sojourns in the humblest hovels of ignorance,—neither disdaining the one nor being honoured in the other,—but in both commanding, consecrating both into a temple of the Lord.”*

A passage on Greece associated with Paul’s preaching at Athens will exhibit his mode of poetizing in prose :

“There rose the social spirit to soften and refine her chosen race, and shelter as in a nest her gentleness from the rushing storm of barbarism ; there liberty first built her mountain throne, first called the waves her own, and shouted across them a proud defiance to despotism’s banded myriads ; there the arts and graces danced around humanity, and stored man’s home with comforts, and strewed his path with roses, and bound his brows with myrtle, and fashioned for him the breathing statue, and summoned him to temples of snowy marble, and charmed his senses with all forms of elegance, and threw over his final sleep their veil of loveliness ; there sprang poetry, like their own fabled goddess, mature at once, from the teeming intellect, girt with the arms and armour that defy the assaults of time and subdue the heart of man ; there matchless orators gave the world a model of perfect eloquence, the soul the instrument on which they played, and every passion of our nature but a tune which the master’s touch called forth at pleasure ; there lived and taught the philosophers of bower and porch, of pride and pleasure, of deep speculation and of useful action, who developed all the acuteness and refinement and excursiveness and energy of mind, and were the glory of their country when their country was the glory of the earth.”†

This is very beautiful, very Byronian, very oriental ; but it is the colouring only of that side of the peach which, according to Persian fiction, is ever presented to the sun.

In the sermon on *Gathering up the Fragments*, he rises from the thrift of domestic duty, through the axioms of political economy, to the aims of the highest research and the noblest philosophy. Not alone does he teach the “waste not” and the “want not” of the household—not alone that individual wealth is represented by the savings of the one,

* II. 188.

† III. 194.

and national wealth by the savings of the whole—he bids us gather and treasure up all that the past has bequeathed to the present and the future.

“Make all available. All physical traces of the former state of the globe itself, ‘fragments of an earlier world’—the petrification which had life, the strata which were the bed of ocean; all material remains of human art—the coin with its image and superscription, the implements of war or industry, pillars and pyramids; all relics of obsolete civil or religious polity, modes of government and modes of worship which are no longer practised on the earth, with the manners and habits, even to the very recesses of domestic life, which they produced; the literature of bygone ages, and not merely the laboured works written for posterity, but the occasional and temporary productions which throw so much more light on the individuality of the intellect of a generation; and the incidental indications of character, of mind and heart, in illustrious individuals, which unfold the depths or point to the heights of humanity itself;—these are the true fragments of antiquity, the remains of the feasting of the multitude that once sat in their ranks on the sunny side of the mountain, but are now in the dark valley of death below. Let them, by all whose means and pursuits allow, be gathered up. If many a brave vessel of human power, greatness and splendour, has been wrecked in the storms of time, let us yet pick up what the tide throws on the shore of our age and country.”*

“Let the gospel reappear without spot or wrinkle, in all the loveliness, dignity and power of immortal truth; impositions and restrictions and traditions and narrow-mindedness and animosities and superstitions and inconsistencies, individual and national, fading from its presence; and all kindreds, people and tongues, rejoicing in its light, walking in its liberty, and raising in holy union the first strains of that final song of glad redemption which shall resound throughout the universe of God!”†

The object of the discourses “On Right and Expediency” is to shew that morality and the common good demand the preference of the higher to the lower responsibility. Differences of opinion on such a topic generally grow of a misunderstanding as to the meaning of words. A utilitarian moralist would argue that what is right in itself is expedient, and that the test of expediency is its direction towards, and its final consummation in, what is right. If for a temporary object a certain course of action should be deemed expedient

* III. 231.

† II. 222.

which in its final results should prove mischievous, a wider view of expediency would prevent the entering upon that course. Mr. Fox calls "expediency the morality of the country," which he deplors and condemns; but, allowing that with a proper interpretation "the right and the expedient do coincide," it is his object to shew that, according to the common and accepted phraseology, there is "a real and broad and vital distinction" between the "right" and the "expedient," and this of course is true if the writer determine that the words shall have a different and even an opposed meaning. He takes as one of the foundations of his views the well-known Declaration of Independence of the United States of America. It lays down as a "self-evident" proposition that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights," &c. But this "self-evident" proposition is most undoubtedly untrue. Men are *not* created equal, neither in physical strength, nor in intellectual power, nor in social position, nor in any of the circumstances which constitute individuality. Nor have they inalienable *rights*, for they have no rights but those which the laws or the usages of society confer, and which those laws and usages can and do suspend or alienate in the interests of society. These rights Mr. Fox calls "the exposition of the largest expediency," but they are neither substantial facts nor intelligible principles. A great deal of ingenuity is displayed in associating "expediency" with "error" and "right" with "truth," and the conclusions are irresistible if we concur in the meaning of the words employed in the premisses.

In the discourse entitled "The Three Ideas of Christianity," Roman Catholicism is represented to be "a system or plan for the salvation of men's souls by the agency of a priesthood." It may be doubted whether an intelligent Catholic would accept such a definition, or whether the definition might not be similarly employed as regards a large section of the Anglican and some other Episcopalian churches. It is quite true that the Papacy in ancient time "felt its gigantic strength, and used it like a giant. It claimed independence of social arrangements and political authorities; and from claiming independence of them it advanced to the assertion of supremacy over them."* Has

not the cry of Church and King often represented a similar pretension? Is there not the same element in the claims put forward in convocation to decree and determine all matters of creed and doctrine? Mr. Fox points out how the notion which is "interwoven with all degrees and forms of Protestantism," that "Christianity is a mode of salvation by faith," naturally led to the enforcement of tests, to the imposition of creeds, and to a "Protestant bigotry and persecution having something in it more bitter and deadly than that of Popery." The suppression of a "damnable opinion" may be more fierce in its action than the suppression of a "damnable insubordination," but is it not the fact that in the views of the persecutor the persecuted is to be punished for *both* heresy and disobedience?

The philosophical idea of Christianity is the repudiation of creeds. We must welcome inquiry, come whence it may, rather than set up the image of our own faith and require others to bow down in adoration. The conclusion at which Mr. Fox arrives is, that the Protestant notion of Christianity had its time and its use, but having superseded one nuisance, has become a nuisance in its turn; that individuality must advance on sectarianism, and "the philosophy which has been allowed to modify particular interpretations, and by the truths in modern science, in geology and astronomy, to supersede the liberal construction of Genesis and the locality of heaven, must eventually indicate the genius of revelation itself."†

The discourse on "What constitutes a Saint?" is the application of the same progressive views to a special, almost an individual subject, ending thus:

"When thought broods over humanity, its course, progress and destiny; when affection blesses life and the grave gives dust to dust in hope, there is true sanctification. In all these varied processes, as well as in the lowliest supplications ever offered, the most glowing hymn of thanksgiving ever sung, the purest religious precepts ever enforced, or the beatific homage of heaven itself, there is the true sanctification, the beauty of holiness, the presence of Divinity."*

The five discourses on National Education, after disposing of the negative part of the inquiry and determining what

* P. 296.

† P. 312.

education ought *not* to be, enter largely on the discussion of those general views whose adoption are needful for giving to public instruction a really national character. The question, after all, is really this, How can the human faculties be turned to the best account? By what educational influences can ignorance and error and vice be most successfully checked, and appropriate knowledge and virtue be most extensively cultivated? The object is undoubtedly the very highest to which patriotism or philanthropy can direct its energies. Through it and in it we should look to posterity. The functions of the teachers of youth are, or ought to be, the mightiest levers for the onward movement of the world. Mr. Fox insists that voluntary effort has failed to accomplish the desired end. It is not potent enough, nor sagacious enough, nor active enough, to heave up barbarism from its abysses, to remove crime from its temptations, to raise the uninformed multitudes from their degradation; it has done something, but how very much more has it left undone! Education is a religious work, but religious in the higher sense of religion. All art, all science, all knowledge, has in it the religious element which becoming instruction will serve to develop. But the religion of phrases, the religion of formulas, the religion of creeds, the religion that alienates man from man, that draws distinctions between sects, that drags polemic controversy into the school-room, that traces its lines of demarcation between heterodoxy and orthodoxy—such religion cannot be a part of national education. The Bible has in it admirable materials for instruction, but the Bible as a whole could not be used as a school-book. It cannot teach science; it teaches but a small fragment of history; the Old Testament, especially, is encumbered with much that is of little interest and of no concern to our modern civilization. Mr. Fox is scandalized with the reflection, that while “the classics” are deemed the proper aliment for the aristocracy, “the Bible” is flung to the “poor,” and thus “the Bible, education and poverty, are degraded altogether;” and certainly the examples he gives of the manner in which the Bible is used in the national schools sufficiently warrant the severity of his judgment.

In the discourse on Moral Power, Mr. Fox repudiates the doctrine that “moral power is only physical force in

perspective." No doubt it has other instruments to work with than the apprehension of consequences. The political history of mankind, however, affords too many a confirmation of Bentham's dictum, that "the subject many never obtained concession from the ruling few except by making the ruling few uneasy." A sense of insecurity on the part of the possessors of power has often compelled the surrender of its privileges and monopolies, and, when potent and profitable, the dread of the invasions of "physical force," and no nobler motive, has led to their abandonment. The influence of the will upon the will, is potent and peremptory; that of the understanding upon the understanding, though slow, is sure, where freedom of speech is allied to freedom of thought. Power, both moral and physical, is multifarious in its action and multitudinous in its instruments. Fear and hope and love all serve to advance the process of the ages.

It was a bold text that Mr. Fox adopted for his sermon on "The Church Establishment as inconsistent with the Spirit of Christianity and the Well-being of Society"—"The entire New Testament." Its all-embracing character was eminently suited to the tone and temper of his mind. Though these volumes are replete with annotations on verses from the Bible, and scripture quotations are very frequently made, yet the most felicitous passages are those in which the teacher is under the influence of the spirit rather than the letter of the Great Volume, and escapes from the trammels of a few words to the wider regions of multitudinous thoughts. He is the able translator of an original which he has thoroughly comprehended; but in his interpretation allows himself to be diffuse, and gives much latitude to his imagination. In fact, finding texts to be an encumbrance, or that none could be found completely to suit his object, he abandoned their use, and his later lectures have no other motto than the titles placed at their head. This remarkable sermon was introductory to a petition, presented in 1834 to the House of Commons, praying for the separation of the Church from the State. After the lapse of the third of a century, there is consolation and encouragement in recording the progress which liberal legislation has made. This petition prayed for a better registration of births, marriages and deaths; the emancipation of marriage from prescribed

religious ceremony ; the opening of the Universities to students of all opinions ; the abolition of church-rates. These grievances, now removed or in process of removal, are represented, with many other evils, as the emanations from the master-grievance, the alliance of the Church with the State. The strongest of the grounds taken by the eloquent teacher is that the Anglican Establishment is a creed-imposing, rite-exacting Church.

"When and where," he asks, "did the Great Teacher ordain that in all great actions of life there should be certain forms of words, true or untrue, appropriate or inappropriate, decorous or indecorous, believed or not believed by the speaker or hearer as the case might be,—but that still in the great actions of human life such forms should be recited by certain persons, with certain garbs, and in certain places, in order to sanctify those actions and give them validity ? Can anything be more unlike than all this is to his ramblings over Judæa, undistinguished himself and his apostles by garb and pretension from the mass of his countrymen ; telling beautiful parables of the parent and the prodigal, the master and the labourer ; little regardful of the ceremonies of sabbath or of synagogue ; doing good in any way, and worshiping in any place, in city or in wilderness, by the river's side or on the mountain's top ?..... The longest creed in the New Testament has but two articles, and both of these are brought into perplexity and confusion by the Established faith."*

The Lectures on Morality, as modified by the various classes into which society is divided, cannot properly be called Lectures, as they consist of discourses not read but extemporaneously delivered, and are republished from reporters' notes, and an apology is made for their many and very obvious literary defects ; yet they are very complete as a general survey of the moral field, and exhibit remarkable evidences of the power of that oratory which fell spontaneously, or without written aid, from the preacher's eloquent lips. He starts from the utilitarian ground that "morality is the source of happiness," and develops the principle that "morality includes whatever advances us in the knowledge of the laws of material nature, of mind, or of social science. It includes whatever principles the natural philosopher can arrive at by the classification of his accumulated facts ; whatever truths the metaphysician may detect by his more

recondite researches ; whatever the statesman can attain of political science from the teachings of history or the results of his own experience and observation ; the right application of whatever mechanical machinery may be employed by the manufacturer in the production of the necessities or the convenience of life ; and of whatever mental machinery may be employed by the teacher in the development of intelligence and of character. They all come under this head, Morality ; for they are all capable of supplying means that may be employed for the production, the multiplication, the perpetuation of human happiness.* Beneath so vast a canopy, multifarious indeed may be the gatherings. It was an irresistible habit of Mr. Fox's mind to break away from the minute to the greater, from the meaner to the mightier, from the lower to the higher, the highest contemplations.

Starting from what may be considered the lowest and the least privileged, though the most common, condition of man, that of poverty, he points out the power of social combination as an instrument of morality. Since he wrote, the Associations at Rochdale and many other places have shewn, not only the practicability, but the marvellous success of such combinations. He shews how ignorance is the parent of want, and want of misery and crime, deplores the little acquaintance which the few who rule have with the many who serve, and urges most emphatically that the instruction and elevation of the multitude is the concern, as it is the interest, of all. There are touching pictures furnished by those to whom the state of the working classes was thoroughly known, and the whole summed up in a demand for the universal education of the people. We want more of their own contributions, in order to be better acquainted with their thoughts, feelings and opinions. No one of them has ever risen to an influential social or parliamentary position until prosperity and opulence had detached him from the class whence he sprung. It is not so in France,† nor in Switzerland, where working men have been elected to senatorial honours ; and we cannot but remark in passing, as a

* VII. 1, 2.

† A volume entitled "Le Secret du Peuple," by M. Corhot, a carver in wood, and who was nominated a Deputy for the capital of France in 1848, is full of information as to the opinions of the *ouvriers de Paris*.

hint to those who dread the paramount influence of the labouring classes, that no solitary example occurs to us of any one of their body having been nominated to a seat in Parliament, to represent that *democracy* which is a word "of such fear and terror"—no, not even from any borough where the working men are supposed to be in the ascendant.

He passes from the morality of the poor to that of the rich, from those who labour below to those who rule above, and revels in the contrast between those who achieve greatness and those who are born to greatness. While pointing out that there can be no blank equality or identity in the human constitution, that there must be a variety in humanity like that which obtains in the stars of heaven or the productions of earth, he delights to compare "Nature's aristocracy," the "noble of mind," the gifted of genius, with those who are honoured with rank and title simply because "the son of the son of the son of a man who won a battle, or who burned a fleet, or who betrayed a kingdom, or who was the illegitimate offspring of a sovereign, or who was accessory to the restoration of the Stuarts or to the expulsion of the Stuarts."* This is partial and one-sided, no doubt; for though many an honour may be traced to a polluted source, many are the exceptions among the nobility of England. The Chinese system of ennobling upward instead of downward has much to recommend it. They confer distinctions, not on the descendants, but on the ancestors of their great men. Who they were and what they did we know, but we know not what their children will be or may do. The wise may have foolish offspring—the worthy, worthless ones; so, say the sages of China, "let us honour the good of the past and the present, for with them we are acquainted, and not give distinctions to people of an unknown future, of whose deservings we are absolutely and entirely ignorant."

To the influences of aristocratical morality Mr. Fox attributes the monopolies of education and of social position, the passion for gambling, the laws of entail, the difficulties of divorce, the false position of woman, and many other evils, which, though associated with, have not their origin solely in, the source to which he traces them. Nor does he forget other tendencies as belonging to the same pernicious influ-

ence—"irreligion and hypocrisy," "public and private dishonesty," agricultural and commercial privileges and monopolies, and other social evils. Because they would be invidious and loathing, he avoids personal illustrations; but he cannot refrain from introducing a few, and comes to the conclusion that "these lectures have a personal application," and he "would make them have it, for they have all of them an individual bearing." His impulses are indeed so strong, that he is driven by them to extreme positions—certainly not indefensible ones, for he defends them bravely—but standing on the very outskirts of permitted licence. The strong convictions of strong minds lead inevitably to strong expressions, and they are the only ones that produce sensation in days of fierce controversy. Impassioned songs are said to have more influence on the character of a nation than codes of laws; and one of the keenest observers has asserted of one of the most intellectual of European nations, that it is always under the despotism of a current apophthegm. The power exercised by Mr. Fox over his audience was maintained by brilliant flashes of thought and expression, by startling antithesis, splendid colourings, whose very brightness and beauty served sometimes to conceal their imperfections and their exaggerations.

The eloquence of Mr. Fox is indeed like a mountain stream; it rushes on with unconstrained vehemence; and if now and then it seems to rest or flow forward with less impassioned movement, it is only, as it were, to acquire a renovated force for another outburst. Dulness and heaviness never belong to the words of his lips or the produce of his pen. Impetuosity was indeed one of his characteristics, but that impetuosity does not drive him beyond the limits of truthful and honest conviction. So whenever his emotions carry him beyond the limits of decorous censure, after his energy has transfixed his opponents with his sharp spear, his tenderness pours oil upon the wounds he has made. There is a true specimen of sarcastic power in a description of aristocratical morality as supporting the Corn Laws:—"They have been reading scripture! Why I can read scripture too. Listen: the Epistle of St. James, chapter v.: 'Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered;

and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as if it were fire,'—and so forth." And then the preacher says—"God forbid I should adopt these denunciations!" but goes on to declare that the evils of which Englishmen have to complain "are of a far more enormous description than were those of the monopolists of Judæa, against whom the apostle James poured forth the fervency of his soul."* This is eloquent advocacy, but there is something special, something partial, in the pleadings. Such eloquence is characteristic of those in whom

"The sense of wrong
Breaks out in torrents of melodious song."

The lecture on "Legal Morality" announces that law, to have the full effect of a moral principle, should be "made by the common consent; be founded on just, philosophical and comprehensive principles; be brought to the knowledge of every one who is subjected to its dictates; be simple and universally intelligible; be so administered that justice should be promptly and cheaply obtainable and by honourable means; and be revised from time to time with the progress of improvement."† In so far as these ends are accomplished, law and morality are twin sisters, though law is confined to a narrower sphere of action; in so far as they are thwarted or superseded, then law ceases to be the ally of morality. Bentham he claims as his great instructor in the study of law reform, and has for the finale of this discourse:

"There is no wisdom, there is no virtue, but as they are subservient to the production of the greatest amount of good; so that wise law, sound morality, genuine religion, as well as universal interest, are the realization of 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number,'‡ the production of the greatest amount of enjoyment to sentient being universally."§

The discourse on "Clerical Morality," which closes the

* P. 51.

† P. 115.

‡ The phrase was Dr. Priestley's. Bentham says, A.D. 1764—"Warrington was classic ground. Priestley lived there. What would I not have given to have found courage to visit him! He had already written several philosophical works; and in the tail of one of his pamphlets I had seen that admirable phrase, 'greatest happiness of the greatest number,' which had such influence on the succeeding part (which some erroneously call the after part) of my life."—Memoirs, I. 46.

§ P. 136.

series, opens with a noble picture of what religion ought to be as "a department of morality." But the main purpose of the author is to prove that our clerical system, far from being adapted to moral purposes, is in much of its organization and influences immoral. The youth destined to the clerical profession is not selected on account of his aptitude, either moral or intellectual; but in most cases because patronage will do for him all that fitness ought to have done. His university education is usually associated with habits little suited to him who is to be a teacher of the poor, and the instruction he there receives has scarcely any reference to his future duties. Then comes the "swearing in to service and slavery"—the subscription to articles of faith, often unintelligible, often contradictory, but binding even though the studies of maturity should disprove to his conscience and convictions the dogmatic declarations of his youth. Then the prescribed formula of worship—the same words uttered at the same times, whatever be the state of his thoughts or feelings—the responsibility of being the "retainer" or the "absolver" of sin—his mode of remuneration, his dependency, his false position with his Dissenting brethren, and the alliance of his authority with the world in that which is most worldly. Thus is religion "entangled in the grossest and most corrupting of human concerns," instead of being occupied, both in solitude and society, in teaching man "that which he is to be and to do, and forming in him the moral image of his Maker."•

The three discourses on Death are full of beautiful, consolatory and elevating thoughts. They are almost entirely confined to a survey of the opinions of the ancient Jewish and classical world, and to an exhibition of the inconsistency of orthodox teaching with genuine philosophy and with divine revelation. Mr. Fox shews that the Hebrews had, if any, the most shadowy and imperfect conceptions of a future life. He contrasts the tranquillity, the pathos and the poetry with which the Greeks contemplated the extinction of life, with the gloomy horrors which a corrupted Christianity has associated with the future fate of man. The dread of death is one of the many contributions to the misery of life which we owe to a false theology, and has, as

• P. 190.

Mr. Fox shews, been a frequent torment to men whose whole course of conduct should have led them to look with complacency on an event in itself inevitable and universal, and consequently occupying an important place in the whole scheme of Divine Providence. It is an embarrassing fact that the Egyptians, Greeks and Etrurians, had more distinct anticipations of man's immortality than existed among the Jews. The conveyance of the emancipated spirit over the river of Death, as seen in many of the old sculptures on the banks of the Nile—the dreams of the Elysian Fields—the sepulchral monuments which may be studied at Volterra, where angels are transporting the soul from the mansion of death to other and brighter abodes—to say nothing of the funereal ceremonies almost universal among Oriental nations—all look to something beyond the boundaries of this mortal being. The passage is striking in which Mr. Fox speaks of Grecian usages and opinions concerning death :

“They avoided the very name of death, and described it by varied circumlocutions ; they called it sleep, or implied that a man was dead by asserting that he had lived. They surrounded it with quaint and graceful fancies. It was the post of affection to watch by the expiring individual, to receive his parting breath, the breathing forth of his spirit, of his soul. The corpse was bathed in oil and crowned with flowers. The honey-cake was put into his hand, and coin into his mouth, that it might not be molested by the watch-dog of the gates of Hades, nor delayed by the ferryman of the river of oblivion. As it was borne to the grave, the melody of flutes modulated the wailing of mourners ; it was burnt on piles that were redolent of aromatic fragrance ; the ashes were collected in those graceful vases on which the eye yet delights to look for the beauty of their forms, even though they contain the ashes of the dead. When either the corpse or the urn containing the ashes was buried, a pillar or statue marked the spot, flowers grew around, and the sacrifice and the banquet concluded the day of separation.”*

The motto of the concluding address is the key to what follows on the representation of the Christian view of death :

“The idea of immortality sprang up from the grave in the Arimathean's garden, in the definiteness of doctrine and the tangibility of fact, to re-animate the moral world.”†

* P. 233.

† P. 246.

The dread and disquiet with which a man of high intellect like Robert Hall contemplated death, is compared with the serene complacency of Joseph Priestley. The heathen Socrates stands out in advantageous contrast with many a Christian saint when listening to the last summons. The nobler views of Bacon are quoted and dwelt upon—"The mind fixed and bent upon somewhat that is good doth avert the dolours of death."

"The moral sense" is represented by Mr. Fox as belonging to man wherever man is found. The proposition may be doubted. In the lowest grades of humanity it is not discoverable. A notion of the rights of property is its earliest development, but that notion among rude races has little of morality in it, and is scarcely distinguishable from the sense with which the beast defends his prey against an intruder and surrenders it to superior strength. Historical man represents a great advancement upon his primitive condition—naked, unhoused, cooking no food, and careless for the morrow. How many "millions of ages have gone to the making of man," is a problem that will probably never be solved. That we should now be asking the question is a marvellous evidence of progress. Religion, at all events, can have had no aliment until a "moral sense" dawned upon our race. It is not true, as Mr. Fox asserts, that the notion of a Church, in some shape or other, has prevailed from the earliest periods; and it may be said once for all, that if our knowledge of man as *he is*, is made the test for judging of man as *he was*, we shall be led into strange errors of fact and of fancy.

So, again, the idea of a heaven and a future life can never have occurred to those who did not concern themselves even for the adjacent to-morrow. Heaven, says Mr. Fox, is one of nature's dreams; but such a dream would never have troubled the repose of savage life. A man unable to count ten would never "dream" of calculating an eclipse; nor would the eye which looks with utter indifference on the beauties of earth, whether waking or sleeping, be ever turned towards the beatitudes of heaven. In making the stand-point of our own acquirements the position whence we review the state of man in the remote ages of the past, or anticipate what he is likely to be in the distant era of the future, we should remember how imperfect are our means of

comparison ; but of this we may be sure, that the farther we look back or the farther we look forwards, the greater will the contrasts with the present be. We drag out some materials for our contemplation from the records and the ruins of time ; but, with the wonderfully accelerated progress of inquiry and discovery, the probable future condition of the human race is beyond the estimate of the highest philosophy. Mr. Fox has faintly sketched the notion of "heaven" from "local, sensual enjoyment" up to "a chorus of redeemed intelligences." We at all events must be satisfied with the declaration, that "it doth not yet appear what we shall be."

The conclusion at which Mr. Fox arrives is, that "there is a religion of humanity"—a religion not bound up in any book, not confined to any country, not limited to any time ; that its formulas are not words or observances ; that it cannot be positive because it is progressive ; but that it is rooted in the very nature of man, and will expand with the expansion of his intellectual powers. On the subject of Christian miracles, he asserts that other religions have miracles as wonderful, more wonderful, more numerous. He demands for Christianity a new birth, that it may be fitted for the demands of a more intelligent age. As in Judaism there was that which has endured and will endure, while much has been discarded,—so in Christianity eternal things are enshrined, which neither storm can shake nor science supersede. Such a religion must be self-supported : it is not dependent on books, or forms, or creeds ; it cannot be established by law, because it cannot be defined by the legislator. The history of established religions is contention, war, persecution—success nowhere, but everywhere failure. A religion fit for the world is the only religion fit for a nation. The instrument which is to accomplish the great work is education—education founded on such views of religion as have been here enunciated.

And this is the conclusion :

"Man should be less inclined to criticise the failings of different modes of worship than to detect what there is in them of truth and beauty, and with that to find himself in heartfelt sympathy. He will look for it, delight in it ; the common thoughts of religionists he will prize more than their varying opinions, as in character he will regard the common elements by which our human nature is built up even to its ideal perfection. He will

look onward with none of those man-created fears that make another world so terrible. All worlds to him are but portions of one system, governed on one principle, filled with the same power of Almighty love. He will look at a passage from one of these states to another as only keeping him within the same security of Almighty care and paternity. He will feel his oneness with what is nearest Divinity on earth, and so be assured that all other scenes and all future ages will only unite him more closely with his God. And, resting in such hopes, his mind will rise above the atmosphere of collision and perturbation; he will ascend towards that calmness and blessedness which are the characteristics of the Infinite and the Eternal.

"Time is rapidly bearing the world on to more enlightened opinions, perhaps, than any of us in the present generation hold; and yet more rapidly is time bearing on individuals to that state where mistakes and ignorance shall vanish away, and where our just, though here imperfect, speculations shall present themselves in all the truth and the grandeur of glorious and eternal realities."*

While through the whole tenor and temper of these discourses the general principles of truth and duty are kept constantly in view, they are full of special and practical applications to individual, social, national and general objects. If he speaks of the claims of the poor, it is not only that we should relieve their wants, but elevate their condition, moral and intellectual. What is called charity, however high it may rank in the scale of commonplace excellences, must have a far wider interpretation, and be exercised on a greatly more extensive scale, than is ordinarily appropriated to its claims. Indiscriminate or undiscerning almsgiving is often not the consecration but the prostitution of charity. Money spent in encouraging the acerbity instead of the philanthropy of our nature is worse than thrown away. The pleasure of bestowing seeming benefits may be as pernicious upon bestower and bestowed, and upon society at large, as if the purpose itself had been mischievous. Preaching the gospel is less the business of words than of works,—of works which present themselves wherever there is a misery to be relieved, a defect to be remedied, a felicity to be augmented. We make the grand results remote of an enlightened and enlarged beneficence,

* VIII. 321.

because we fancy them to be so. We call our hopes speculations, when we might verify them into realities.

Of the manner in which Mr. Fox turned to moral and religious purposes the passing events of his time, we may with some benefit give an example.

One of the most important events, if not the most important, in the social and political history of the present generation was the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws and for the triumph of the principles of Free Trade. That agitation began in the action of a few enthusiasts, but it spread over the land like a moral inundation—became omnipotent—was carried into the legislation of the country—and is making new conquests through the whole world of commerce and civilization. In that great work Mr. Fox was an early, earnest and most successful labourer. It was a work suited in every way to the specialties of his nature. It represented sound political economy—it was a people's question—it was philanthropic—it was Christian—it furnished abundant materials for impassioned eloquence and irresistible reasoning—it grew grander and stronger with the ever-growing encouragement of popular opinion. Every weapon needful to accomplish a great victory was supplied by the national feeling. Men's hearts and heads and labours,—the zeal of the poor, the purses of the rich,—all brought their contributions and contingents for the advance and accomplishment of an object worthy of so noble an effort, and bringing with it such rich reward. And the triumph was all the greater, as the strongholds of monopoly were manned by all the forces which the landed aristocracy, represented by large Parliamentary majorities, could supply. Even a Whig Prime Minister denounced the movement for the total repeal of the Corn Laws as a madness, and declared that its advocates were fitter for Bedlam than for the reasonable world. The organization, worked out by a few master minds,—the discussions, spread over but a few years,—may be said to have revolutionized opinion, and in the social field to have led to consequences as important as those which the discovery of the law of gravitation produced in the field of philosophy. Even the selfish and sinister interests which allied themselves with some popular fears and more of popular ignorance, have discovered that in the extension of the national wealth, in the increase

of the national contentment, in the new securities for peace and progress, there has been unexpected compensation and consolation,—and it would now be almost as easy to find among philosophers an advocate for the Ptolemaic theory, as a supporter of the protective system among educated or thoughtful men. The published volumes present a very inadequate representation of the services rendered by Mr. Fox by voice and by pen, in the pulpit and the press, in private conference and on the public platform, for the overthrow of a gigantic evil. The actors were indeed worthy of the great drama in which they played their several parts, bringing about so felicitous a denouement. The Anti-Corn-Law League will stand prominently out in the future history of this kingdom as a model of organization, by which moral and pacific influences were the sole means used, and used effectually, for the removal of heavy and long-existing grievances, and for obtaining the recognition and adoption of principles sternly repudiated by the agricultural and privileged classes, and whose anticipated benefits to the laborious multitudes were certainly by them only inadequately appreciated.

The “Moral View of the Corn Question” takes for its groundwork that a betterment in the physical condition of the population brings with it moral and religious benefits to society. It is scarcely needful now to go over again the often-trodden ground. To preach to the converted has been held to be a work of supererogation. And yet many impediments remain to fetter international intercourse. We venture to dream of days when no custom-house shall levy a toll or place a restriction upon the interchange of the varied product of the earth or of the labour of man.

Mr. Fox's position among the Unitarians was in many respects an embarrassing one. His intellect entitled him to a very high, if not the highest place among the ministers who were his contemporaries; while the latitudinarianism, or perhaps better, the freedom of his opinions, tended to alienate their sympathies, and to make any very intimate or harmonious action difficult or impossible. Long before separation, he was rather among than of the Unitarian body. How far, as a body, the Unitarians may be willing to allow and encourage the fullest emancipation of religious thought and action—how far they may insist on the imposition of

some form of Christian faith, or oppose any attempt to inquire into the creed of those who are willing to worship with them—whether some definition of the word Unitarian may be demanded as a trial or a touchstone of *their* Christian orthodoxy—is a problem which will perhaps not be immediately solved. Certain it is, that among the mass of Unitarians there are many—most estimable and conscientious men—who hold that somewhere—the *where* being the question at issue—somewhere the line of separation must be drawn, beyond which, if there be not excommunication, there must be excommunication. Mr. Fox did not join a gathering of Free-thinking Christians, most of whose distinguished members have now merged in the greater Unitarian community. They had their periodical, it had but a short life; they had some eminent men who in their early conflicts displayed a courage perhaps characterized more by jactancy than prudence, and their attacks were more distinctly directed against those with whom they nearly agreed than against those with whom they most markedly differed.

Though Mr. Fox's nature was genial and affectionate, it was not without its sharp corners, which sometimes wounded the susceptibilities of others. The tendencies which would have led him to a spontaneous fusion of thought and friendly co-operation with those in whose convictions he for the most part concurred, were checked whenever coldness or seeming disapproval hesitated to welcome his views; and he often sunk into the silence, not certainly of ill-humour, but of reserve. When he felt completely at home, nothing could be more lively, entertaining and ready, than was his conversation, and the clever things he said were uttered with singular gravity, frequently followed by an explosion of laughter which shook his rotund frame with a very odd agitation. His bright eye was constantly on the watch for food for his humour, and his wit was terse, original and bursting out in sudden corruscations. An earlier training would have made him a statesman, but he could not emancipate himself from something of a polemical habit of utterance, which, however efficient in the pulpit, has seldom found acceptance in a legislative assembly. Yet his speeches at large gatherings of the people, whether addressed to his constituents or to the more important and more influential meetings of the Anti-Corn-Law League, were singularly

popular and telling, and usually elicited enthusiastic applause. He never seemed ambitious to find opportunities of haranguing the people, but when invited to take a part he was ever ready, and invariably did the work well which was confided to his sagacity.

He was not profoundly learned, but his reading was quite sufficient to furnish him valuable materials for history; and though he never professed or exhibited any remarkable acquaintance with the literature or the language of other countries or other times, his knowledge of both was quite adequate to the demands ordinarily made on cultivated minds.

To the great cause of progress, to the spread of liberal opinions and the recognition of popular rights, to the denunciation and redress of private or public wrongs, to the removal of abuses, to the diffusion of education—in a word, to the advancement of every object associated with the elevation and happiness of the people, he lent his willing and potent aid. His connection with the newspaper press enabled him to render more services than were ever known or will ever be recognized. No doubt the influence of a signature may be great, but perhaps greater is that *anonymous* power which is self-supported, and derives none of its momentum from the authority of a recognized name.

There is one period of his history, extending over many years, in which we only saw him in the distance or met him in the public field. His thoughts had ceased to be specially directed to theological questions, yet he watched with a good deal of interest the controversial disquisitions of the day, and he gradually surrendered all the hold which the belief in the supernatural once had on his mind. The Mosaic account of the creation, the narratives of miracles recorded in the Old Testament, he had long rejected; and it was only a short time before his death that he told me he concurred in the general conclusions of Strauss as to the miracles of the New Testament. But he placed the sayings and doings of Jesus on a higher level than is assigned to them by the German metaphysician. Fox's temperament was too warm and imaginative not to be touched more sensibly with all the beauty and the poetry presented in the humanity of the Great Teacher than a cold reasoner like Strauss could ever be. Perhaps out of Channing, Parker, Strauss and Renan, an amalgam might be produced which

would represent with some fidelity the creed of W. J. Fox ; if, indeed, that can be properly called a creed which is subject to every "starry influence," and changed and modified by every new revelation of critical or philosophical research.

The amount of courage displayed by those master minds which are in advance of their age, and are the heralds and leaders of future change, can only be estimated by a reference to the preparation of the public temper for the reception of novel opinions, and to the extent of obloquy which attaches to their profession. "Ripeness," as Shakespeare wisely said, "Ripeness is all." Fox no doubt moved with the age, but somewhat in advance of the age. Yet detached from the Unitarian body, with which he had been long and intimately associated, he found no other to welcome him to its bosom, but stood alone and aloof from any existing sectarian organization. And perhaps it is the tendency of the times to disintegrate opinions, and to separate men from one another rather than to unite them by any gregarious influences. The results of inquiry in the present condition of knowledge are rather to elicit points of difference and dissension than to resolve discordant views into anything like a common conclusion. A new era is announcing itself in the breaking up of authority on all sides, in the diminished respect for tradition, in the sharp and untiring investigation of historical criticism ; and, more than any of these, or than all of them, in the modern revelations of science, bringing with them grander conceptions of time and space, and unrolling through countless ages the plans and processes of Eternal Providence. The foundations of ancient creeds and beliefs, which represent little but the dogmatic ignorance of those who made them, and the servile spirit of those who profess them and would impose them on others, are shaken by an irresistible power ; and all thoughtful minds are bent upon the inquiry as to what is to be saved out of the ruins, what is imperishable in the midst of so much that is assuredly passing away. If Sir Isaac Newton was right in saying that a purer Christianity would make its way into the world through the portals of a general scepticism, we may already anticipate the advent of such a consummation.

Much curiosity was manifested in the House of Commons when William Johnson Fox first took his place—a place

which he ever after occupied—on one of the back seats of the House. I do not recollect on any occasion to have seen him occupying the front benches. He came into Parliament, having acquired a considerable reputation, though that reputation was somewhat hazy and undefined, in the minds of Honourable Members. He was supposed to be a sort of heterodox Methodist parson—a black crow whose strong wings and great ambition had brought him into the companionship of his betters, and an example of the sort of persons whom Radical constituencies would favour with their suffrages. The men who have been considered mob representatives were for the most part remarkable for their gentlemanly demeanour in the House. Henry Hunt was a gentleman by birth, and inherited his landed estate from an ancestry of many generations. The honest boldness with which he avowed that, in order to improve his condition, he had become a blacking manufacturer, won for him some consideration and a certain popularity even among people of quality. On one occasion, when an Honourable Member, whose shoes wanted cleaning, reproached “the orator” with being a blacking-maker, he calmly replied that the said Honourable Member would have done better had he been one of his customers.

William Cobbett, who never made long speeches, had the ear of the House when he in Committee went into details, and shewed how much of practical good sense there was in his nature, and how much he could control that coarse and vituperative style which in his writings he was so fond of displaying. Fergus O'Connor was of a ruder mould, though he belonged to one of the distinguished families of Ireland, and was a nephew of that Arthur O'Connor who married Condorcet's daughter, and was the intimate friend of Lafayette, and a general not without fame in the revolutionary armies of France. Gulley, the renowned prize-fighter, the Champion of England as he was called, was a man whose manners were a model of good-breeding, though the grasp of his strong hand shewed his athletic powers. But we know of none whom Fox in any way resembled. The first impression made was not fascinating. He looked a short, fat, jolly, country bumpkin, with black hair hanging over his shoulders—it grew white from age and care—and with a somewhat ungainly gait; but if you caught his eye, it

was full of intellectual fire, and his countenance was marked with the impress of philosophic thought. His oratory, which had been trained and tutored to suit audiences very different to those whom he had to address in Parliament, was never quite relieved from its pulpit and polemic character; yet, as he spoke seldom and always to the purpose, he was listened to with respect. He never uttered a hasty or impatient word, and seemed especially cautious to avoid associations or recollections which might have lowered him in the estimation of those whom he addressed. In his desire for distinction he was never impulsive or intrusive, and he always spoke so well that he would have been borne with and even applauded had he spoken more. His speeches generally are characterized by large and generous views, full of philanthropy and of special affection and regard for the working classes. It was their good opinion which gave him his elevated position, and he did all that depended upon him to justify and to respond to that good opinion.

Fox was a frequent contributor to the *Westminster Review*, in which he wrote the first article of the first number, entitled "Men and Things in 1824." Though very eloquent, there are some positions in it which may well be disputed: it is not true that "money-getting is the great object on which men are intent," though it is most true that such is the prominent purpose of *many* men. The desire to acquire wealth no doubt pervades, and that necessarily, a large portion of society; but there are many other and nobler impulses at work. If too mercenary, we are not wholly mercenary. Wealth itself has been a wonder-worker in the great march of civilization. To its accumulation we owe railways and the multitudinous facilities for communication which have given so great an impulse to the national prosperity. Increased wealth has raised the labourer's wages, augmented his comforts, elevated his education, prepared him for the exercise of political rights. Two-and-forty years ago, it was the boast of the writer that "shoals of twopenny magazines issue from the press, some of them respectably got up, and circulating to the amount of several thousands weekly."* Now we may triumph in the fact, not of *thousands* of twopenny periodicals issued *weekly*, but that *hun-*

dreads of thousands of penny newspapers circulate daily ; not only some of which are creditably edited, but that the great mass of this enormously augmented literary production is conducted by many of our wisest heads and contributed to by our ablest pens ; not only providing food for the multitudinous labouring classes, but finding a welcome reception among the most cultivated. This "new power" has acquired a development far beyond the calculations of those who in those days were called "dreamers." A generation ago, it was almost a truism to announce that the world was "divided into two great classes, the oppressors and the oppressed, each having their holy alliances ;" but we have now certainly reached an era in which an influence has arisen greater than either—strong enough to help the "servile many"—strong enough to influence the "ruling few."

Though written many years before the Reform Bill of 1832, the article exhibits full confidence that an extension of the elective franchise was ere long inevitable. Public opinion had been ripening for changes, and at the present moment there is no great peril in prophesying that the gathering of another political harvest cannot be far away. We now read in the pages of the present the anticipations ratified and realized which were recorded by the sagacious observers of the past. Though the view taken by the writer is grand and expansive, it is far from being exhaustive. The revolutions of opinion which have been brought about by scientific discovery, especially in the geological world—the more searching and elaborate criticism by which history has been explored, especially in the Biblical portion—the marvellous results which facilitated intercourse and emancipated trade have introduced—were not unveiled to the speculations of the wise, or even the anticipations of the good, nor even to the imaginings of the sanguine, though it is sagaciously said that beneath and beyond what was then seen, silent but grander revolutions were preparing, and that the ploughing and the draining and the sowing of the intellectual field would infallibly produce nobler and more abundant harvests.

Fox was often more remarked for his taciturnity than his eloquence. He would sometimes sit listening by the hour, when it was obvious from the expression of his countenance that many thoughts were passing through his mind

which never found their way to open utterance. At times his breast heaved, his eye brightened, his lips curled into a smile, and words of wit or wisdom fell from him as water drops down a cascade.

At times, however, he contributed his full share to the conversational gatherings, and he would carry on a controversy with eager earnestness. The gravity of his tone was frequently relieved by a sudden outbreak of humour, and the surges of his talk were fringed with a light and sparkling gaiety. The tone of his mind was rather philanthropic than devout. Opinion hampered him in the religious sphere. He was restless and impatient amidst judgments which in his mind had the taint of sectarian bigotry. His field of usefulness might have been widened, his powers of usefulness strengthened, had he allowed more influence to the views and counsels of other men. He entered on struggles against a social momentum which was stronger than his own, and to which he was forced to succumb. He was often severely judged, and sometimes uncharitably condemned. His great powers did not exercise the influence on his day and generation which under other guidance—shall it be called that of worldly wisdom?—they assuredly might have done.

JOHN BOWRING.

VI.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Hebrew Prophets, translated afresh from the Original, with regard to the Anglican Version, and with Illustrations for English Readers. By Rowland Williams, D.D. Vol. I. The Prophets of Israel and Judah during the Assyrian Empire. London: Williams and Norgate. 1866.

A new Translation of the Hebrew Prophets, with an Introduction and Notes. By George R. Noyes, D.D. Third Edition. 2 vols. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1866.

It seems at first sight astonishing that Protestantism should have for several centuries endured to be tied down on the first Reformers' Procrustean bed of the infallibility and sufficiency of the Bible. It is, however, less surprising

than it seems. If the Bible were a book of few chapters, which could be learned by rote in a few weeks, its character would have been determined at once ; and if striking inconsistencies, absurdities, or degrading conceptions had been detected in it, the minds which revolted at the traffic in indulgences would have rejected the book as equally undivine. But it is a collection of writings the most various in subject, in aim, in moral and religious principles, that have ever been bound in one volume ; and produced in most various ages, places and circumstances. Many ages of study were therefore requisite to understand it—would in any case have been requisite, even if men could have gone to it without preconception and prejudice ; and were so still more under the existing conditions, when the Church had so long had free play to put her own arbitrary meanings on its every part. Meanwhile, thinkers of every school could find something in it that spoke to their hearts, and were content, in their pleasure at that, to pass over and forget whatever they found repulsive or antagonistic. Thus arose that pernicious system of selection and exaltation of isolated texts, and partial interpretation, which retarded the understanding of the Bible as a whole. All united in magnifying the authority of the Bible, in which they found the religious ideas they wanted ; and the emancipation of thought from ecclesiastical fetters only tended to a more eager study of, and a more ready subserviency to, the Bible.

But this could not be the permanent condition of things. The study of the Bible might be begun in the interest of a school or a theology ; but it must gradually get into the hands of persons of judicial impartiality, who would consider their primary duty to be to see, not what isolated opinions might be found there, but what the *whole thought* of the Bible was—*how, in what order, and when* each thought arose. The habit of impartial judgment upon evidence, which had become axiomatic in science and law, forced them to abandon the old method of inquiry, which assumed as a starting-point the mutual consistency of the teaching of books known to be distant by many ages from each other. It was seen that that assumed the very thing that had to be determined ; that till that was settled nothing was settled ; that of the use and the meaning of the Bible to us nothing could be affirmed till we knew the use and meaning of its various

books in their respective ages, and in their relation to one another. It had to be studied *de nova*.

This new study has many branches. The first and most obvious necessity is the settlement of the text. Till we know what words were written, we know nothing for certain; we can be sure of no doctrine and no sentiment supposed to be expressed there, nor build up any scheme of Biblical history. It is now well known that the text of the New Testament is very different from what had been generally circulated under that name; that scarcely a line is now allowed by the best editors to stand exactly as it was; and that though the majority of these corrections are minute, and scarcely perceptible in a translation, yet some few carry most serious doctrinal consequences, and a large number are in other respects important. For the Old Testament the means of textual emendation are not so ample, because its books were received at a far earlier age as sacred, and inviolable, and committed to the keeping of one single nation characterized by a scrupulous and superstitious observance of the "letter," very different from the freedom and volatility of the Greeks, for whom the New Testament was written. Still, in the early ages, before the Hebrew writings were surrounded by that halo of sanctity, we should suppose from analogy that greater textual differences must have existed; and in fact the divergences observed between the two texts of the few passages which occur twice (as 2 Sam. xxii. and Ps. xviii.), together with the constant deviations of the Septuagint and other ancient versions, and other indications, make it evident that the received Hebrew text of the Old Testament is not more perfect than the received Greek text of the New.

The second requirement is an accurate understanding of the text, and expression of its meaning in translation. The old translations are so literal and faithful in the main, that this want has been only tardily and hesitatingly recognized. Yet it is here perhaps that the old assumption of mutual consistency of fact and identity of doctrine has done most mischief, and that the impartial inquiry may do most good. The rule of the former was, that the same word must in the practice of every Biblical writer mean the same thing; the latter cannot admit without proof the supposition that men whose thoughts differed so widely as Moses and Solomon,

or John and Paul, coincided in their language. The old translations, from their fatal doctrinal assumptions, are inadmissible as evidence of either fact or doctrine; the new are at least attempts according to the ability of the translator to present the exact meaning of the original text. If the new translation is in nine lines out of ten identical with the old, still there is all the difference between one constructed impartially, and one framed to suit a theory. The one is evidence, and the other is not.

The third requirement is a commentary which shall explain the text. The explanation of the meaning of obscure words, and analysis of peculiar grammatical constructions, is comparatively little affected by the altered standing-point of the modern expositor; and it is here that the work of the old scholars is least obsolete. But the commentator who is not satisfied, and does not wish his readers to be satisfied, with minute verbal criticism, and essays to give a complete history of the book,—looking for every indication bearing upon its scope, ethical principles, age, locality, or authorship,—will find but little of the work done for him, and may establish results which to the unlearned world at least will be new and surprising.

This important threefold work, however, though in great measure new to England, has already lived through a half century in Germany. Editions, translations and commentaries, based more or less strictly on the principles I have just laid down, have been published for every book of both Testaments, and generally in sufficient numbers to ensure a thorough ventilation of opinion, rejection of the bad, and confirmation of the good. These books have all issued from the centres of learned opinion—the Universities, and have consequently been freely canvassed in the personal intercourse as well as in the writings of scholars. As things are, then, every writer on this subject must follow the Germans; and scarcely any but German names will appear in his list of authorities; for there are no other modern authorities. It is very undesirable that this should be. As there are individual prejudices and peculiarities which are taken out of a man by contact with society, so there may be national prejudices, even on the field of learning. An Englishman would not, perhaps, always draw the same conclusion from a datum as a German; and in such a case it

is not probable that ultimately the truth would be found entirely on one side.

As well, therefore, for the enlightenment of our fellow-countrymen, as with a view to the most impartial ultimate settlement of these questions, does such an English publication as Dr. Rowland Williams's new translation of the Prophets deserve the warmest welcome. The first volume includes the Prophets of Israel and Judah during the Assyrian Empire (Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Nahum). The remaining Prophets will be taken in chronological order in two following volumes. It is an injury to a book of so much labour and merit to pretend to judge it from the first volume only. It is to be hoped that this Review will give a more matured opinion on the completed work; and I now only briefly call the attention of readers to the first volume, which will well repay study. The upper part of the page is occupied by the translation, and the lower by notes of elucidation; between the two are given in smaller type critical notes on the Hebrew text, points of Hebrew grammar, &c. Each book is preceded by an Introduction, giving the necessary information on the circumstances amid which and the end for which, it was composed; attaching it to the events to which it relates, as recorded in the histories. The rise and development of ideas, especially the great idea of the Messiah, are here not forgotten. The well-known clearness, vigour and simplicity of Dr. Williams's style are eminently displayed throughout this volume; and the reticence and terseness exhibited in the notes is especially commendable in a clergyman, who might have yielded to the temptation of sermonizing. Only very rarely does he indulge in any "improvement" of the text by application to the modern church, and then chiefly in relation to questions in which he has played a conspicuous part. The following is worth quoting, on Isaiah i. 9—11:

"But is the Prophet writing for his own day, or for ours? Incense, and Sabbath, and Convocation, a weary round of forms and processions, are they pleasanter to God now than of old? Isaiah spoke of his own time; but the spirit of his words applies to all time in which like occasion arises. What would he say of consecrating bells?"

I cannot close without expressing some dissatisfaction with the course steered by Dr. Williams in his critical notes.

A translator may either present his version without note or comment to the general body of Bible readers, leaving it to commend itself by superior clearness in argument and exactitude in expression,—as Mr. Sharpe has done; or, offering it in the first instance to the judgment of the learned, he may anticipate the questions which they will put to him, by notes justifying his new renderings or readings. A middle course between the entire absence of notes and the addition of a full critical commentary, is perhaps a possible, but a delicate and difficult task; and it is not clear what class of readers can derive information from notes like the following (on Is. i. 12, “When ye come to behold my face,” &c.) :

“*To behold my face; or, to appear before me.*”

The unlearned reader would suppose from this note that the same Hebrew words might have either sense; and the recurrence on every page of similar notes giving alternate renderings would go far to engender the suspicion that Hebrew words may mean anything, or at least that no one knows what they mean. No alternative translations should be given without a critical estimate of their respective claims; and no alteration of the received text or the ordinary punctuation admitted without due notice. Give us results only (i.e. the translation), if you like, as Mr. Sharpe; but if you offer us also the process by which those results are attained, give us the whole process. I would suggest also that so important an innovation as the translation of the Divine name Jehovah by its assumed equivalent, “the Eternal,” instead of the substitution for it of the title “the Lord” (Sept. *Κύριος*), ought to be justified to the unlearned by an exposition of its grounds; and I would recommend Dr. Williams to append a dissertation on this subject to his next volume. One complaint of a very practical nature will be made by every one who tries to use the book. Not only are the numbers of the chapters omitted from the margins, and only to be found by turning over the leaves till the beginning of one is found; but Isaiah is positively divided anew into chapters and verses, and not even a comparative index of the old and the new numbers is vouchsafed. In the course of writing this paper I actually found a reference to Cruden’s Concordance the shortest way to the original of one passage!

A new edition (the third) of the "New Translation of the Hebrew Prophets" by Dr. Noyes, Professor at Harvard University, has just been published at Boston by the American Unitarian Association, in two very neatly printed volumes. It is preceded by an able and interesting Introduction of about 90 pages, not previously published, on the nature of Hebrew Prophecy. The author shews that prophecy was essentially a moral and spiritual, and not a clairvoyant agency, and that its declarations of the fate awaiting special cases of sinfulness or idolatry were justified by the event only when expressed in very general terms. The various phases of the Messianic doctrine, especially as expressed by the younger Isaiah (Is. xl.—lxvi.), are also carefully exhibited, and proved to describe a Servant of God very different from Jesus Christ. The writer then looks back from the New Testament age upon the old prophets, to consider in what sense (if in any) their expectations can be regarded as fulfilled in Jesus. Fulfilled they were, he says, but by transcending in scope, spirituality and permanence all that had been imagined of old.

The translation is printed in short lines like poetry, a method which exhibits to the eye the parallelisms and all other peculiarities of the Hebrew style. It is surprising that this practice is not followed by all translators of the poets and prophets of the Old Testament. No one who has experience of it will ever go back to the old method. It brings into view many poetical charms of style, and often makes the course of thought far more evident. There is, however, room for considerable difference of opinion as to the details of the divisions; in my judgment, the verses are here prevailingly broken up into too many, and without sufficient recognition of approximate uniformity of length in the divisions; and the larger syntactical relations between the sentences are not adequately observed. But the version is essentially elegant, clear, and above all faithful; and it is because I esteem it so highly that I regret it does not take the few steps further in advance which I have just indicated.

RUSSELL MARTINEAU.

Miscellaneous.

M. Guizot has just published the second (which according to his original plan ought to have been the third) series

of his *Meditations on Christianity*.* It bears the general title of "*Meditations upon the Actual State of the Christian Religion*;" but is, in fact, confined to a statement of the condition of theological and philosophical thought in France, the references to other countries being few, and introduced only in illustration of his main topic. The first Meditation, which occupies more than half the volume, and is its most interesting and valuable portion, is entitled, *The Christian Revival in France*. Divided into two parts, relating to the Catholic and Protestant Churches respectively, it deals with the gradual re-awakening of the religious life since the wild era of the Revolution. To all this part of M. Guizot's work a great interest is added by the fact that he has been a principal actor in many of the great changes which he briefly but graphically describes, and has lived on terms of personal intimacy with the distinguished men whose labours he records. His history of the Catholic revival is agreeably tinged by his well-known partiality for the Ancient Church: few Protestants who have clung firmly to their Protestantism amid many temptations have so little anti-papal zeal. He tells with evident sympathy the tale of the fruitless attempt made by Lamennais and Montalembert to unite loyalty to the Pope with political and ecclesiastical liberalism: he does not abandon his defence of the temporal power: he laments rather than condemns the Encyclical of Pius IX.: he records without misgiving the latest triumphs of the religious orders in France: and he even seems to entertain the belief, which every word of his story shews to be groundless, that some reconciliation between Roman Catholicism and liberal institutions in Church and State is still possible. Perhaps the truth is, that he fears Rationalism more than he hates Popery.

The volume does not contain a single reference to the controversies which are now dividing the Protestant Church. And this may be the reason why the Protestant is so much less satisfactory than the Catholic section of his first Meditation. In describing the re-awakening of French Protestantism, beginning from the period at which the Revolution ended its long trial of persecution, he seems to move in

* *Méditations sur l'État Actuel de la Religion Chrétienne.* Par M. Guizot. Paris: Michel Levy Frères. 1866.

fetters, because there are tendencies and influences of which he does not choose to give an account. Although his convictions are Protestant, his heart, if we may judge from the tone of these chapters, is with the Catholic Church: he seems to look upon Christianity as valuable, not so much in itself, as in its efficacy as a bulwark against social anarchy, and so sets the highest estimate upon its oldest and least changeable form. The remaining Meditations upon "Spiritualism," "Rationalism," "Positivism," "Pantheism," "Materialism," "Scepticism," "Impiety, Indifference and Perplexity," are of far inferior value. Not only is M. Guizot much weaker upon the philosophical than upon the historical side, but these are matters not to be adequately discussed in a few pages.

Dr. M'Cosh* regards the philosophy of Mr. J. S. Mill as the logical result of a doctrine "floating in nearly all our later metaphysics, that we can know nothing of the nature of things," and he tells us that "when Professor Ferrier propounded the theory that one's self mixes as an integral and essential part with our knowledge of every object," he predicted that "the next phenomenon appearing in the philosophic firmament must be a Hume or a Fichte;" and he sees in Mr. Mill at least the partial fulfilment of this prophecy. Ferrier himself, we believe, would have been a pure idealist or egoist, had he been perfectly consistent; but as regards the modern doctrine of what is called "the relativity of knowledge," we may remark that there is surely some difference between saying that we know nothing of the nature of things, and doubting whether there are things to be known or even a mind to know them, and it is to this that Mr. Mill's philosophy would naturally conduct us. Dr. M'Cosh seems to push the common-sense principle to its extreme, and sometimes speaks as if nothing was to remain ultimately inexplicable either in our minds or in the objects of knowledge; but even the disciples of Hamilton will readily acknowledge that he has done good service against the sensational school. He has subjected Mr. Mill to a thorough and searching examination, and refutes triumphantly, we think, the doctrine that mind is but "a series of feelings which is aware of itself, as past and future,"

* An Examination of Mr J. S. Mill's Philosophy, being a Defence of Fundamental Truth. By James M'Cosh, LL.D. London: Macmillan. 1866.

and that matter is—or is known to us as—but “a permanent possibility of these feelings.” Although, perhaps, philosophy is justified in pursuing her course regardless of consequences, still, as Dr. M'Cosh reserves any question of that kind till the discussion is over, we can hardly blame him for asking in his last chapter whether Mr. Mill proposes to leave us eventually either religion or a God. We are sure that our English philosopher is far too wise to follow in the steps of the founder of Positivism, and attempt to construct a religion *without* a God—though he has told the world recently that the thing is possible; but were he to do so, it is quite likely that the result would be no better than Dr. M'Cosh anticipates:—

“There is no risk of the British school setting up a religion and a worship so superbly ridiculous as that of M. Comte; but I venture to predict that when it comes, it will be so scientifically cold, and so emotionally blank, as to be incapable of gathering any interest around it, of accomplishing any good—or, I may add, inflicting any evil.”

A work of a very different order of value is “*E pur si Muove*,”* a series of very short essays on such subjects as Authority, Truth, Space, Time, Good and Bad, Theology, and the like, addressed by Mr. N. A. Nicholson, M.A., “to those who can think calmly and reason closely.” These are not topics to be discussed and disposed of in two or three pages, least of all by a writer who can calmly utter such amazing platitudes as Mr. Nicholson. When we say that the essay on Authority consists wholly of an extract from Jeremy Bentham, that on the Antiquity of Man of a leader from the Daily Telegraph, and that for an essay on Space Mr. Nicholson commits the impertinence of substituting *four blank pages*, we are afraid that any of our readers who belong to the select jury before which he seeks to plead, will not care to give him a further hearing.

To turn from philosophy to theology, we welcome in Dr. Young's Essay, “The Life and Light of Men,”† the work of a thoughtful and deeply religious mind. Dr. Young, who was formerly a minister of the United Presbyterian Church,

* *E pur si Muove*. By N. A. Nicholson, M.A. London: Trübner. 1866.

† “The Life and Light of Men;” an Essay, by John Young, LL.D. (Edin.). Alexander Strahan, London and New York. 1866.

laid down his charge a few years ago in consequence of his recognition of the fact that his theological opinions no longer coincided with those contained in the confession and formularies of the Church in which he had been brought up. Since then he has in several publications laid before the world his grounds of dissent, and publishes this last volume with a deep feeling that the doctrines which it contains have been a blessing to him, and an aid in the development of his own religious life, which he therefore may not withhold from other men. The great object of the work is to overthrow the commonly accepted doctrine of the Atonement, and to prove that what is technically put forward in evangelical churches as "the gospel" is an unscriptural as well as an irrational theory. This task is most thoroughly accomplished, and in a manner which we believe will prove all the more acceptable to many minds, as it is advocated in connection with theories on the nature of Christ and the inspiration of the Scriptures which modern criticism, as far as our author is concerned, has assailed in vain.

The central thought of the book is, that

"Salvation is not escape from the consequences of sin, present or remote; it is not this at all; it is only and wholly deliverance from sin itself, from that deep internal cause which entails such consequences, be they what they may. The root of perdition in the soul must be struck at and destroyed; and only in so far as this is struck, and no further, is real safety achieved. The self-will in resistance to the Divine will, the false bias of the spiritual nature, the conscious, voluntary want of harmony with truth and right and love and God, this is a true death, if there were none also in the future. This is eternal death begun. To have life planted, where this death has reigned, is true salvation—nothing else is." *

The immutable and unconditional supremacy of the moral law is insisted upon with very great force, and the hatefulness of sin is all the more forcibly maintained, as it is shewn that no forensic expedient, no transference of guilt by imputation is possible, so that the very ground-work of the vicarious atonement is destroyed. But not only is the philosophical argument ably stated, it is also conclusively shewn that neither the Old nor the New Testament gives any coun-

tenance to the ordinary teaching, while the gradual growth of the idea of satisfaction through its various stages of a payment to Satan, through the absolutely legal system of Anselm to the theory maintained in the Reformed Churches, is briefly but clearly shewn. There is not much novelty in the treatment of the Old Testament sacrifices, which our author shews to have always been for ceremonial and never for moral offences ; but his mode of defending a species of substitutionary sacrifice in the life and death of Christ, while he altogether rejects the idea of expiatory and vicarious suffering, has, we believe, greater claims to be considered new, though, curiously enough, some of his illustrations are almost identical with those employed in a late work by Dr. Bushnell.

The death of Christ, then, is not put forward as an expiatory sacrifice, but as the crowning instance of the loving mercy of God, who through His Son manifests His true nature to mankind. There is a very great charm in Dr. Young's treatment of this power of love to regenerate the heart and to induce a true change of mind, and though we cannot accept for ourselves the theory of the incarnation and of the Divine sacrifice which he advocates, we are not repelled from them by any directly immoral inconsistencies such as are involved in the ordinary hypotheses. To us the manifestation of the love of God in Christ is all-sufficient, even without the modified incarnation advocated by Dr. Young in phrases which at times seem to be inspired by a belief in the proper deity of Christ, and at times are such as could be used by an evangelical Unitarian.

The controversy as to the future punishment of the wicked still gives rise to great searchings of heart among some who are beginning to feel the first breath of free theological speculation. The latest contribution to it is a little volume of sermons, entitled "*Endless Sufferings not the Doctrine of Scripture*," preached to a country congregation by the Rev. T. Davis, M.A., incumbent of Roundhay.* The author seems to be a firm believer in the ultimate authority of Scripture in matters of faith, and conducts his argument upon that hypothesis. But he appears to have been first impelled to the consideration of the question by his view

* *Endless Sufferings not the Doctrine of Scripture.* By Thomas Davis, M.A., Incumbent of Roundhay, Yorkshire. London: Longmans. 1866.

of the moral nature of God. "Before I could believe," he says, "the dogma of eternal misery, I must utterly distrust my best faculties, admit that I have no conception of what goodness is in my Creator, and feel that I am wholly incompetent to offer to His acceptance intelligent praise." * Accordingly he finds in the Scriptures the doctrine neither of the everlasting torture, nor of the ultimate salvation, but of the final destruction, of the wicked. The sermons are simply and clearly written, and are throughout pervaded by a high and pure religious spirit.

"Strauss and Renan" † is the title of an essay by a well-known German theologian, E. Zeller, rendered into English and furnished with an Introduction by an anonymous translator. The essay itself is a clever review article, which brings into clear relief the likenesses and differences of Renan's *Vie de Jesus* and Strauss's *last* or popular *Leben Jesu*, though we hardly know why it should have been selected for preservation in a foreign language. The translation, so far as we can judge without reference to the original, appears to be well executed.—"Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed, by a Layman," ‡ is a sensible little book by one who, convinced of the sole Unity of God, holds in some other respects an intermediate position between Trinitarians and Unitarians. It is chiefly occupied by an examination of the scriptural evidence commonly adduced in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, and if containing nothing novel on a subject so well worn, bears plain marks of candour and sincerity.

Every one of Mr. Ainslie's "Discourses delivered in Christ Church, Brighton," § contains evidence of the warm heart and thoughtful mind of their author; but as the sermon which is most satisfactory when read in the printed page, is seldom the one which was best adapted for its original purpose of a spoken address from the pulpit, it is no dispraise to say that they are fitter to be listened to than to be read. What has particularly struck us in them is,

* P. 57.

† Strauss and Renan, an Essay, by E. Zeller. Translated from the German, with Introductory Remarks by the Translator. London: Trübner. 1866.

‡ Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed, by a Layman. London: Trübner. 1866.

§ Discourses delivered in Christ Church, New Road, Brighton. By the Rev. Robert Ainslie. London: Longmans.

that while Mr. Ainslie shews every token of extensive and varied reading, and, in a way worthy of all imitation, deals with some topics not generally considered congenial to the pulpit, he at the same time often quietly ignores, as though he had never heard of them, the conclusions of recent critical scholarship, and takes for granted matters which are usually considered at least open questions. This is probably the result of design rather than an oversight. Examples of what we mean are the observation* concerning the book of Genesis as "embracing a period of 2315 years, and containing the earliest *historical* records of the human race;" the assertion† that "Moses was learned in all the learning of the Egyptians, before he wrote a line of Jewish theology or literature;" the reference to the latter part of the book of Isaiah in the words, "Isaiah taught these practical truths 700 years B.C."‡ Nevertheless, the writer is quite able to base his arguments on the widest philosophical grounds, and takes his illustrations with equal felicity from the Scriptures and from the revelations of science. In fact, there is not one of the discourses but abounds with passages which must have made it interesting and instructive to those who listened to it. At the same time, the volume, as a whole, fails to give a clear indication of the writer's theological stand-point, and leaves an impression of a want of unity and definiteness of purpose.

Mr. Coupland's little volume of sermons, which he entitles "Incentives to the Higher Life,"§ would be easier to criticise if the author clearly indicated and consistently adhered to a single theory of the relation of the human being to religion. But amid much pomp of phrase, we miss any distinct statement of his position. His prevailing language would lead us to believe that he regarded religion from the purely philosophical point of view, as the outcome of human thought, though every now and then a phrase occurs to prove that he has not wholly shaken off the associations of the religious theory which includes a spontaneous movement of God towards man. But his cardinal doctrine appears to be what he calls "belief in man's self-adequacy."

* P. 4.

† P. 66.

‡ P. 161.

§ *Incentives to the Higher Life.* By W. C. Coupland, B.A., B.Sc. London: Trübner. 1866.

"By belief in man's self-adequacy I mean the unwavering trust, that as each creature that ever breathed has been structurally sufficient to its destiny, so the highest of all creatures cannot fall below that standard. We reject *in toto* the notion that man has ever forfeited the power of self-guidance, or is intrinsically incapable of rising to his possible height. If man sins, he sins by his entire consent (else it is not sin, but mere misfortune); if he does right, he simply obeys his native impulses: neither the instigation nor the support comes from Devil or God. There is but one argument against such a view of man's nature as this, and that is, that if we rate ourselves so highly, we shall become in process of time unbearably conceited. Possible, of course."^{*}

Considering that just before Mr. Coupland had said, "Had we walked beside Plato, Cæsar, Jesus, we should have thought them very every-day companions,"[†] we think it not unlikely that the majority of our readers will agree with him.

Of the numerous pamphlets which lie upon our table, one group reflects the changeful aspects of what may be called the "reconstruction" movement now going on in the religious body commonly known as Unitarian; and from the rapidity with which this controversy, like every other, assumes fresh phases, are hardly susceptible of criticism in a quarterly Review. In "The Living Church through Changing Creeds,"[‡] the reader will recognize a reprint of an article by Mr. Martineau which appeared in our last number.—"The Kingdom that cometh not with Observation,"[§] is the title of a sermon, characterized throughout by a very thoughtful and earnest eloquence, in which Mr. Drummond insists upon the principle that "the value of all social influences is to be measured by their power of developing individual life." We apprehend that none of his readers will question this: the problem to be solved is the degree in which any given organization may be expected to exercise this power.—Dr. Beard's four "Letters

^{*} P. 85.

[†] P. 84.

[‡] The Living Church through Changing Creeds. By James Martineau. Reprinted from the Theological Review. 1866.

[§] The Kingdom that cometh not with Observation: a Word for the Times concerning Representative Organa. By James Drummond, B.A. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1866.

to the Unitarians of England"* are a strong appeal on the conservative side of the same important argument, of which it will not be expected that we should say more in this place.—Belonging to the same group, though as an outlying member of it, is Mr. Gordon's "Christianity and Unitarianism,"† a sermon preached at the first general meeting of the Midland Christian Union. In this Union have been absorbed, not without much amicable difference of opinion, two local Associations, each of which bore the name Unitarian upon its front; and Mr. Gordon's sermon is a very able and lucid statement of the reasons which have induced the promoters of the Union, while abandoning in no degree their allegiance to their personal convictions of theological truth, to distinguish it ecclesiastically only by the name Christian.

We are glad to notice the republication in a separate form of the correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Capetown, and the Bishop of Natal,‡ as well as of two sermons preached by the latter at D'Urban and Pietermaritzburg§. It is strange how large an influence polemical sympathies exercise upon moral judgment: in the opinion of a large class of Churchmen, Dr. Longley is an Ambrose, and Dr. Gray an Athanasius; while to us it appears all the advantage in the controversy is on the side of the brother upon whom they look down from such a height of conscious superiority. We hope in our next number to be able to give a careful estimate of the state of the Colenso controversy, which seems every day to become less capable of a clear and satisfactory issue.—Mr. Voysey continues to publish some of the sermons which he preaches in the ordinary course of parochial duty, in the series which he calls "The Sling and the Stone."|| All in the parts now before us are distinguished by a

* Letters to the Unitarians of England: 1, 2, 3, 4. By J. R. Beard, D.D. London: Whitfield, Green & Son. 1866.

† Christianity and Unitarianism, a Sermon, &c. By John Gordon. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1866.

‡ Letters from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Capetown, and the Bishop of Natal; with Observations. London: Trübner. 1866.

§ Two Sermons preached by the Bishop of Natal, &c. &c. London: Trübner. 1866.

|| The Sling and the Stone, &c. Parts VI. VII. VIII. By Charles Voysey, B.A., Incumbent of Healaugh. London: Trübner. 1866.

laudable outspokenness. The two on the Cattle Plague are probably the best: there is a want of insight in the three on Balaam, Esau, and the Temptation of Abraham.—“The Symbolism of the Church”* is the title of a pleasing sermon by Mr. J. P. Hopps, the outward form of which, however, is not adequate to its substantial merits.—To “The Eternal Gospel,”† a very thoughtful tract, in the series issued by Mr. Thomas Scott, we may possibly return when the promised second part is published.—Last, but far from least in worth, in this miscellaneous assortment of pamphlets, comes a lecture on “The History of the Printed Greek Text of the New Testament,”‡ delivered at the Hartley Institution, Southampton, by Mr. W. L. Adye. We are unfeignedly rejoiced to see such a subject so treated by a layman’s pen; and we congratulate Mr. Adye on the production of a lecture which must have engaged the attention of all who take a grave interest in Biblical subjects. We cannot, however, quite understand how, after the adduction of so much evidence which appears to us to tend to a quite opposite conclusion, Mr. Adye can express himself in terms of even modified approval of the present received text.

Although it is not our custom to notice second editions, we are glad to call our readers’ attention to the re-issue of two books of so much value as Dr. Southwood Smith’s work on “The Divine Government”§ and Mr. Baden Powell’s “Christianity without Judaism.”|| Both, though in different ways, were pioneers in the great theological reformation which is now taking place.

E.

* The Symbolism of the Church: a Sermon, &c. By the Rev. John Page Hopps. Ashton-under-Lyne. 1866.

† The Eternal Gospel, or the Idea of Christian Perfectibility. Part I. London: Williams and Norgate. 1866.

‡ The History of the Printed Text of the New Testament, &c.; with a Supplement. By Willett L. Adye, Esq. London: Rivingtons. 1865.

§ The Divine Government. By Southwood Smith, M.D. 5th Edition. London: Trübner. 1866.

|| Christianity without Judaism. By Rev. Baden Powell, M.A., &c. &c. 2nd Edition, revised. London: Longmans. 1866.

THE THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

No. XV.—OCTOBER, 1866.

I.—THE “SON OF GOD” CONSIDERED AS A TITLE OF THE MESSIAH.

EVERY attempt to reconstruct the life of Christ is an attempt to lift a thick curtain which hangs between the Greek and the Hebrew world. It is an attempt, not merely to cross the interval of time which separates our earliest canonical Gospel from the events it records, but to some extent to pass from one order of ideas to another. It is an attempt, moreover, if the results of criticism may be accepted, to pass behind the gilded clouds of legend which have gathered around the figure of the Son of Man, and to bring ourselves face to face with the realities which they have partially obscured. It is a fact, the consequences of which we have no desire to exaggerate, but which nevertheless must not be neglected, that our whole New Testament is written in a language which to the Galilean followers of Jesus was a foreign one. We do not in the least doubt the competency of Greek to express with accuracy whatever was originally spoken in Hebrew; for, to say nothing of the living power of the former language at the time when it was called upon to perform this great service for the world, the Alexandrine version of the Old Scriptures had already provided a home in a heathen tongue for the thoughts of the people of God. Still, we cannot forget that Christianity from a very early time—from the time of the apostle Paul, himself a Hellenistic Jew—has been the result of a union of Hebrew with Hellenic thought, and that the composition of our four Gospels must be looked for at a point considerably below the junction of the two streams. Among the established results of criticism it may be counted one, that

for the facts of Christ's life and the doctrines and modes of speech of primitive Christianity there can be no appeal to the Johannine writings, with the exception of the Apocalypse. Another is, that we do not possess any account of the life of Jesus in the precise words of one of his apostles, the Gospel of Matthew, which according to early testimony was written in Hebrew, not having been preserved. It can hardly be maintained that our Greek Matthew is a literal translation of the Hebrew original; but, on the other hand, there is no doubt that our canonical Gospels were preceded by some written material, as well as by an oral tradition which they have incorporated to a greater or less extent with their own substance. Making, however, all due allowance for this fact, if it be certain, notwithstanding, that forty years at the very least elapsed between the actual events of Christ's life and our earliest record of them, it cannot be very rash to suppose that the Greek Gospels may possibly have received some colouring from the influences in the midst of which they originated.

Nor have we any scruple in assuming the existence of legend in the New-Testament writings. We are justified in doing so by the same fact—the lapse of a considerable number of years—which justifies us in assuming the possible introduction of phraseology unknown to the natives of Palestine. Many who adhere firmly to the miraculous, are compelled to admit the presence of certain elements not belonging to the world of reality; and there are few, we presume, who would hesitate to transfer the voice from heaven at the baptism, the temptation in the wilderness and the transfiguration, from the objective to the subjective side of the human consciousness. We should not ourselves fear to allow for even a larger amount of legendary matter; nor, often as the bitter alternative of "all or none" is offered to us, do we in the least believe that the truly divine in the character and life of Christ is touched by the most "negative" criticism of the writings which witness it. We do not understand how any one could read the historical sketch in Strauss's "Life of Jesus," though that contains but a portion of the argument, without being convinced of the fallacy of the often-repeated assertion that it is impossible to separate the miracles from the remainder of the narrative, so as to leave any foundation on which to rest. On the general

question, however, we here pronounce no judgment. We merely say that we do not bind ourselves to accept as fact all that is recorded as fact.

We are now about to apply these principles to a particular phrase of frequent occurrence in the New Testament—"the Son of God," as a title of Jesus Christ. Our question is, how far this title was claimed by Jesus himself, or ascribed to him during his life upon earth; and whether it originated in Palestine, in the popular language regarding the Messiah, or had some other origin. Before we could discuss this question, however, it was necessary to state the principles upon which we should proceed. It will be understood, then, that we regard the Synoptical Gospels as the only authorities we possess for the real facts of the life of Jesus; that we do not regard their authority as absolute; that we conceive that they embody an earlier written Gospel which must have been more closely conformed to facts than any of them. For our present purpose it would not be of material consequence whether we preferred Matthew, Mark or Luke; but we follow De Wette, Strauss and other modern critics, in deciding in favour of Matthew. We do not here undertake to prove these principles; we simply state them. Our argument will of course be null and void to those for whom our principles are false.

One other word of preface. We desire to consider the question we have proposed from a purely critical point of view, and without any dogmatic aim. We acknowledge a very profound meaning in the Pauline phrase, the Son of God, and even in the Johannine expression, the only begotten Son of the Father; and we believe that the eternal Word of God, to which in the language of the Jewish-Alexandrine school this latter epithet was applied, found its truest embodiment in the man of Nazareth. As a mere title expressive of the closest relationship which it is given to man to enjoy with the Divine Being, no other can more justly claim to be called the Son of God. But whether Jesus actually did claim this title, or whether it could have been given to him by his countrymen, is a question of criticism; and as such we propose to treat it.

It seems to be generally assumed that the Son of God was a familiar and recognized title of the Messiah, and that as such only it was applied to Jesus of Nazareth. Strauss,

one of the most recent authorities on the subject, tells us that according to our Gospels there were, besides the name Messiah itself or Christ, two other popular designations of the office—Son of David and Son of God.* We venture to think that there was but one popular designation—the Son of David—and that the title "Son of God" was neither applied to Jesus during his life-time, nor ever in use among the people of Palestine as an epithet of the Messiah. Knowing that there is a great weight of authority upon the other side, we desire to speak with diffidence; but there seem to us to be very strong reasons for our opinion; and even if we fail to establish it in our readers' minds, the discussion may not be without benefit in directing attention towards an interesting field of inquiry.

In the consideration of this question we are thrown almost entirely upon the evidence furnished by the New Testament itself; for of evidence immediately contemporaneous with the life of Jesus there is none; and no one will say that that of the Old Testament is by any means explicit or satisfactory. At first view, one would be disposed to say that both the phrase "Son of God" and the idea it might be used to convey are abhorrent to the Hebrew spirit; but of course it is not maintained that the phrase was used except as a title or to indicate a purely spiritual relation; and certain passages have been pointed out in the Hebrew Scriptures which are supposed to have given a warrant for its employment in this sense. Those passages we shall now adduce in the order in which they are referred to by Strauss; only, for convenience' sake, we shall supply the text which he has not given.

"As the second popular title of the Messiah, and as his peculiar name of office, we find in the Gospels the name Son of God. The same name had been given in the Old Testament to the Israelitish people (Ex. iv. 22: 'Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my first-born.' Hos. xi. 1: 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt'), but also to divinely favoured rulers of the people, like David and Solomon (2 Sam. vii. 14: 'I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men.' Ps. lxxxix.

* Leben Jesu, p. 222. Our references here and throughout this essay are to the recently published work.

27: 'Also I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth'), and to their worthy successors (Ps. ii. 7: 'I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee*'); subsequently the expression became a standing designation of the great expected prince of David's family, the Messiah, as we find it in the New Testament."†

Upon these quotations we have to make the following remarks. That precise combination of terms which would correspond in Hebrew to the *υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* of the Gospels, does not occur in any of them. It is, however, found once in the Old Testament—viz. in Daniel iii. 25—where the king of Babylon is represented as desecrating, along with the three men whom he had cast into the furnace, a fourth whose form was "like a Son of God." But this passage is so remote from any Messianic reference, that it is not even alluded to by Strauss. The fourth person here is in fact an angel, and the comparison by which he is distinguished expresses nothing more, being paralleled, not by New-Testament language, but by the mention of the sons of God in Genesis and Job. Indeed, if it was customary with the Hebrews to designate angels in this way, such a practice would be rather unfavourable than the reverse to the title "Son of God" being attached to a particular human personage. Again, it is obvious that the application of the title in question to the whole people of Israel is in no way parallel to its employment as a popular Messianic designation. If God is represented as calling Israel His son, this is merely poetical language which would not easily pass into popular speech. And to the words used regarding David and Solomon, the objection may fairly be urged that they are too indefinite, and mark only a general relationship which might be extended to any individual. The only passage which in our view meets the requirements of the case is that from the second Psalm, "Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee." But we have no means of knowing how early this passage was regarded as Messianic. It is referred to Jesus, no doubt, in the New Testament, directly in the Acts of the

* Strauss also refers here to Ps. lxxx. 16, or 15, as it is in our version; but the word "son" does not appear in the English at all, and as the meaning of the passage is very doubtful we omit it.

† *Leben Jesu*, p. 223.

Apostles,* in a speech attributed to Paul, and implicitly in the Gospels in the words uttered by the heavenly voice at the baptism, the quotation indeed having been more exact in the earlier form of the tradition than in that which embodies itself in our Gospels.† But we do not know that this passage was understood to have any Messianic reference before the time of Paul, and if it be assumed that it had, we may still argue that by itself it could not have established the title "Son of God" in popular usage. At least there appears to us to be a wide difference between the application of a title on a solemn occasion, even though it be in such a very marked manner as in the case before us, and its use as a constant epithet.

The Old Testament, then, supplies no evidence to shew that "the Son of God" was among the Hebrews a recognized title of their Messiah; and, on the other side, we have the fact that the phrase does not occur in any confessedly Messianic passage of the Old Scriptures. We most readily admit, however, that the passages which we have just examined, especially the last one, would sufficiently explain the origin of such a title, supposing the later direct evidence were fairly beyond reasonable question. It is for us to shew, if we can, that this is not the case; and for this purpose it will be necessary for us to pass in review the New-Testament writings so far as they bear upon the question. But first we must briefly notice a class of literature which has been recently attracting considerable attention—we refer to the Jewish Apocalyptic books, of which Daniel is properly the first, and the Revelation, though embodying the Christian element, may be regarded as the last, while the two remaining ones—of unknown authorship and uncertain date—are the fourth book of Ezra and the book of Enoch. Of Daniel we have already spoken, and of the Revelation we shall speak by and by. Meanwhile, it may be said that although the Messiah is called the Son of God in the fourth book of Ezra, the testimony of this work is of no weight, owing to the doubts which attach to the presumed time of its composition. Though purporting to be written long before the coming of the Messiah, it is more than probable that it is of post-Christian origin. Strauss refers it to the year A.D.

* Acts xiii. 33.† Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 344.

97. Nor can more dependence be placed upon the book of Enoch. Here the Messiah is once, and only once, called the Son of God, or rather he is spoken of by the Almighty as "my Son;" but the passage where this occurs is so much at variance with the Messianic imagery of the section of the book to which it belongs, that it may not unreasonably be suspected. It is impossible for us to enter at length into this question here, and we must content ourselves with stating what seem to be the most approved results of criticism. The reader, if so disposed, may consult an instructive article on "The Early History of Messianic Ideas" in the *National Review* for April, 1864, the writer of which unhesitatingly rejects this single reference to the Messiah as the Son of God as "evidence of nothing except the tampering of some Christian hand." There are, however, other passages descriptive of the Messiah where no such elevated title is bestowed, and where he is described quite in the spirit of the celebrated passage in Daniel, as the Son of Man, and as accompanying "the Ancient of Days." These, it is true, are referred by Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, with the approbation of Strauss,* to Christian times and Christian influence; but if the *National Reviewer* is right in ascribing to them an earlier date, the negative evidence they furnish in regard to the use of the epithet "Son of God" may fairly be claimed as making for our side of the question.

We now pass to the New Testament. And first let us turn to the Gospels, taking, as the fullest and probably most authentic, that of Matthew. Here the words under consideration undoubtedly occur as a title of Jesus, but in such a manner, we think, as to raise the question whether they have not been carried back from a later stage in the development of Christianity to a period to which they do not properly belong. In opposition to the assertion of Strauss already quoted, we may at least affirm with confidence that the title of Son of God does not appear in the Gospels as a popular or familiar epithet. There is a strange mystery about its use. Only once during the Galilean ministry was it applied to Jesus by any human being; and that was after one of his most astounding miracles.† After the resolve to go up to Jerusalem, Peter, replying to a question of Jesus,

* *Leben Jesu*, p. 172 note.† *Matt.* xiv. 33.

exclaimed in an ecstasy of enthusiasm, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" but this was in consequence of an express revelation.* The mob, in its more serious moods, addressed Jesus as the Son of David; it was as he hung upon the cross that they called out to him, as if in mockery of some impossible claim, "If thou be the Son of God, save thyself" The high priest, indeed, asked him if he were the Son of God, but then he considered his affirmative as blasphemy, which he would hardly have alleged of a mere claim to be the Christ. On the other hand, it is chiefly by superhuman beings that this name is applied to Jesus. He is announced by a voice from heaven as the beloved Son of God, once at his baptism, and once on the Mount of Transfiguration. The arch-fiend, encountering him in the desert, challenges him to prove his right to this mysterious name. The spirits of the dead—for such were the demons of the New Testament—speaking through the lips of those they had possessed, proved their acquaintance with the spiritual world by saluting Jesus as their Master, and acknowledging his authority. "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?"†

We think there can be no doubt that the mystery we have noticed here attaches to the particular title of Son of God, and to the spiritual nature thereby indicated, and not simply to the Messianic character. We do not overlook the remarkable fact that Jesus invariably called himself the Son of Man, and that this title, as proved by his own question to the disciples, "Whom say ye that I the Son of Man am?" was not of any determined signification. But there is no mystery about the Son of David. Not only is this title not used by superhuman beings, which might be accounted for by the greater appropriateness of the other, but it is freely employed by the human agents in the gospel drama. On the occasion of casting out a demon, the people asked, "Is not this the Son of David?"‡ On two different occasions two blind men used the same term.§ This was the title by which the Canaanitish woman appealed to Jesus for assistance.|| Finally, the exultant crowd, welcoming their

* Matt. xvi. 16, 17.

† Ib. viii. 29.

‡ Ib. xii. 23.

§ Ib. ix. 27, and xx. 31.

|| Ib. xv. 22.

king to Jerusalem, shouted, "Hosanna to the Son of David!"* As far, therefore, as the Messiahship of Jesus was recognized at all during his sojourn among men, we do not doubt that this was the only title used. Are the incidents, then, in connection with which the other and higher designation occurs, to be rejected altogether? Such must indeed be the fate of some of them, but not necessarily of all. The heavenly voices, no less than the Satanic address, whatever explanation may be given of them, we have no scruple or hesitation in removing from the world of objective fact; and we believe that most candid readers will agree with us on that point. But in regard to the human incidents, our criticism affects only the special words in dispute, but not the facts with which they are connected. We do not doubt, for instance, that at Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus for the first time invited and warmly welcomed a recognition of his Messiahship. Peter may have exclaimed, "Thou art the Christ;" but subsequent tradition may have added the words, "the Son of the living God." But the reply of Jesus, that this knowledge had been communicated to the apostle from heaven, can hardly have been really uttered, because it evidently refers to the recognition, not of the Messiahship, but of the divine nature of Jesus; and Peter would not have required a revelation to make known to him what was already a wide-spread belief among the peasants of Galilee. Again, the high priest may have really asked Jesus if he pretended to be the Messiah; but we are not aware that in Jewish eyes there would have been anything directly blasphemous in such a pretension. It is certain, indeed, that Jesus was put to death on a charge of blasphemy; but it was the blasphemy of speaking against the temple, combined with an overt act of hostility to its ceremonial. The homage of the disciples after the storm in which Jesus had appeared walking on the sea, and the particular words in which it was couched, must of course be set aside if the miracle itself be discarded; while, if the miracle be retained, it stands only on the same footing as the instances already noticed. Nor even in the case of the demons would our hypothesis preclude the admission of a certain historical basis. If John the Baptist indicated Jesus even indistinctly as the promised

* *Matt. xxi. 9.*

hope of Israel, a belief in his Messiahship would have gradually spread among the people, and gained strength in proportion as his influence was felt. Such a belief might have made a deep impression on one or two lunatics, who in the excitement of madness, or perhaps in consequence of feeling themselves brought under a commanding influence, proclaimed aloud what others wanted the courage to whisper. But they might have recognized Jesus as the Messiah without calling him the Son of God. This title, we believe, does not belong to the history. It originated some time after the crucifixion; it did not occur (we presume) in the original Hebrew gospel: it was introduced by the evangelists into their Greek text, in order to shew that Jesus was something more than the Messiah, and was surrounded by circumstances calculated to enhance its importance and present it in the light of a mysterious name known only to those who had communication with the supernatural world. That is our theory. We submit that it is most consistent with the facts known to us, so far as our examination has already proceeded.

But we have some further evidence to advance. It would be of great importance if we could shew that the title of Son of God was unknown to the primitive church previous to the time of the apostle Paul. If this could be made clear, it would go far towards proving that the title was equally unknown to Jesus himself and to the nation to which he belonged—that it was not at least a recognized Messianic title. All the direct information we possess regarding the primitive church is contained in the opening chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. We are quite aware of the extreme difficulty of making use of this book, owing to the uncertainty of its authorship and the apparently composite nature of its contents. The early chapters in particular can hardly be defended as authentic history in face of the searching criticisms of Baur and Zeller; but even if allowance be made for the existence in them of a mythical element, it may still be maintained that they reflect with sufficient fidelity the spirit and life of the early church. The author may either have founded his descriptions upon authentic documents or oral tradition handed down from the apostles, or he may have entered so completely into the spirit of the past as to be able to draw a correct picture

from his own imagination. The theory of the Tübingen school is, indeed, that the book was written with no design of recording the true history of the apostolic church, but rather with the view of smoothing down the differences which existed between its two sections and their respective leaders, Peter and Paul. In this view, however, it would be still more striking if one remarkable point of distinction had been suffered to remain in the different phraseology—a phraseology, as we believe, involving a difference of doctrine—of the two chief apostles.

The evidence furnished by the Acts, then—take it for what it is worth—is briefly this, that Paul taught that Jesus was the Son of God, and that Peter did not. Let us examine. Peter, in his address upon the day of Pentecost, speaks of Jesus, in language which the people of Jerusalem would readily appreciate, as the descendant of David, and concludes by affirming that God had made "this same Jesus both Lord and Christ."* On another occasion, after the healing of the lame man, the same apostle uses these words, "The God of our fathers hath glorified his Servant Jesus" (τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ, very different from τὸν υἱόν), and the same expression is repeated at the close of his address.† He also speaks of Jesus as the Prince of life (ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς), the Holy and the Just One, the Christ, and that Prophet,‡ but in no case as the Son of God. In the thanksgiving of the church for the dismissal of Peter and John by the Sanhedrim, we find Jesus twice described as the "holy Servant" of God, where the English version, after having correctly rendered Δαυὶδ παιδὸς σου, thy servant David, inconsistently gives "thy holy child Jesus" for τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου Ἰησοῦν.§ And in another instance, in which Peter acts as spokesman, the epithets employed are Prince and Saviour—"Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour."|| Even Stephen, undoubtedly the precursor of Paul, does not use the title Son of God. Like Peter, he speaks of Jesus as the Just One, and at the close of his address we meet, for the only time in the Acts, with the familiar phrase, the Son of Man.¶ Nor is it until after the conversion of Saul that we find the words of which we have been in

* Acts ii 30, 36.

† Ib. iii 13, 26.

‡ Ib. iii. 14, 15, 20, 23.

§ Ib. iv. 27, 30.

|| Ib. v. 31.

¶ Ib. vii. 52, 56.

quest. At length the scene changes. A new actor, imbued with the Hellenic spirit, comes upon the stage; and Paul "straightway preached Jesus in the synagogues that he is the Son of God."*

For the benefit of the English reader, it may be as well to remark, before we proceed, that the whole of verse 37 of the eighth chapter of the Acts is an interpolation. And lest there should be any question about our substitution of the word "Servant" for "Son" in the addresses of the apostle Peter, we shall quote the authority of Archbishop Trench. After noticing that out of the five passages in which "the title *παῖς Θεοῦ* is given to the Son of God," in one only (Matt. xii. 18), our translators have rendered *παῖς* by "servant," he proceeds:

"I am persuaded that in this they were in error. *Παῖς Θεοῦ* might be rendered 'servant of God,' and I am persuaded that it ought. It might be, for it needs not to say *παῖς* is continually used like the Latin 'puer' in the sense of servant, and in the LXX. *παῖς Θεοῦ* as the 'servant of God.' David calls himself so no less than seven times in 2 Sam. vii.; cf. Luke i. 69; Acts iv. 25; Job i. 8; Ps. xix. 12, 14. But not merely it might have been thus rendered; it also should have been, as these reasons convince me:—Every student of prophecy must have noticed how much there is in Isaiah prophesying of Christ under the aspect of 'the servant of the Lord;' 'Israel my servant;' 'my servant whom I uphold' (Isaiah xlii. 1—7; xlix. 1—12; lii. 13; liii. 12). I say, prophesying of Christ; for I dismiss, as a baseless dream of those who *a priori* are determined that there are, and therefore shall be, no prophecies in Scripture, the notion that the 'servant of Jehovah' in Isaiah is Israel according to the flesh, or Isaiah himself, or the body of the prophets collectively considered, or any other except Christ Himself. . . . I cannot doubt, and, as far as I know, this is the conclusion of all who have considered the subject, that *παῖς Θεοῦ* should be rendered 'servant of God,' as often as in the New Testament it is used of Christ. His *sonship* will remain sufficiently declared in innumerable other passages."†

We need hardly say that we do not agree with the Archbishop's interpretations of prophecy; but his Greek is unexceptionable. The notion that the servant of Jehovah is

* Acts ix. 20.

† Trench on the Authorized Version of the New Testament, pp. 68, 69.

"Israel according to the flesh," is not a baseless dream, but a plain statement of the prophet himself—"Yet hear now, O Jacob my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen."* At the same time, there is no doubt that Peter had in mind those passages of Isaiah which figuratively describe the afflictions of the faithful Israelites under the image of the gentle and suffering Servant of God. It is quite possible, as Strauss suggests, that these passages of Scripture were remembered by the Lord himself when he announced his approaching death to the wondering disciples; and after his suffering they would naturally be uppermost in the thoughts of the apostles. The Archbishop, however, might have added that Peter, speaking in Hebrew, must have used the very word of Isaiah, and was much more likely to have employed a term for which he had such unquestionable authority, than one at best but doubtfully sanctioned by the Old Testament, and not yet recommended by custom.

We have, then, this remarkable fact, as the result of our examination of the early chapters of the Acts, that there is no instance known to us, in the history of the præ-Pauline church, in which Jesus was called the Son of God. Peter gives him a different title even where it would have been natural and appropriate to have used this one. Nor does he alter his usage subsequently to the conversion of Paul. The old phraseology, indeed, is not repeated, but in the address to Cornelius we meet with the statement that Jesus of Nazareth was ordained to be "Judge of quick and dead;"† and Ananias, as quoted by Paul, uses the expression, which has before occurred in the mouth of Peter, of "that Just One."‡ The suppression or modification of the peculiar doctrines of Paul through the later portions of the Acts, it must be confessed, tends to throw doubt on the accuracy of the sketch of the primitive church. But may we not fairly reply, that if the aim of the writer was to reconcile conflicting tendencies, and to make Paul and Peter mutually approach one another, by shading off the characteristic features of each (an aim not altogether inconsistent with historical fidelity), it is the more noteworthy that he has been unable to suppress what must be considered the very foundation of the Pauline theology, viz. that Jesus is the Son

* *Is.* xliv. 1.† *Acts* x. 38—42.‡ *Ib.* xxii. 14.

of God in a sense which raises him far above the Messianic hopes of the Jews? It is true the title does not appear again in the Acts, even in the mouth of Paul, except so far as it is involved in the quotation of the Psalmist's words, "Thou art my Son,"* which the apostle of the Gentiles first applies to Jesus. But neither is Paul made to use the characteristic language of Peter; and we think, therefore, we follow no deceptive light, and at the same time have historical probability in our favour, if we regard that language as the real voice of the primitive church, and take the words of Acts ix. 20 as marking an era in theology.

Of the remaining books of the New Testament there is little to be said. Such evidence as they furnish, if not strongly in favour of our view, is not adverse to it. Indeed, on the whole, we think we can shew a balance upon our side. The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude, nowhere give Jesus the title of Son of God; and of James and Jude nothing more need be said. The language of Peter's Epistle—of course we only speak of the first—harmonizes very well with the words ascribed to the same apostle in the Acts, though there is no verbal correspondence between them. The Epistle, indeed, speaks of the death of Jesus as the just dying for the unjust;† but the word "just" is here hardly so specific as to allow us to regard it as a proper name. Again, Jesus is spoken of as the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls (τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν),‡ as our translators have rather oddly rendered it, and once more as the chief Shepherd (Ἀρχιποιμῆν);§ and such titles are not very dissimilar to those of the Acts, together with which they formed, no doubt, part of the common stock of the primitive Christian nomenclature. The book of Revelation, on the other hand, presents a difficulty. Here we should expect that any approach to Pauline modes of thought or expression would be carefully avoided. We should never expect to find Christ spoken of as the Son of God, if that title was unknown, as we maintain, to the original followers of Jesus. What, then, is the fact? We find the title once, and only once, in this book. The words are, "These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like unto a flame

* Acts xiii. 33.

† 1 Pet. iii. 18.

‡ Ib. ii. 25.

§ Ib. v. 4.

of fire, and his feet are like fine brass ;"* and the description is so similar to that of the Son of Man in the preceding chapter,† that, if there could be any doubt about the reading, one would readily suspect a corruption. Throughout the book, Jesus is generally called the Lamb ; twice, "one like unto the Son of Man ;"‡ also "the faithful Witness, the first begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth" (here, however, not ἀρχηγός, but ἀρχων).§ John also names him the Lion of the tribe of Juda, and the Root of David.|| But is the occurrence of the title "the Son of God" in the book of Revelation fatal to the hypothesis of its late origin, or even its Greek derivation? Not certainly to the former ; for the Apocalypse, though one of the earliest books of the New Testament, was written after the universalism of Paul had roused the opposition of the elder apostles ; and not, we think, even to the latter, because it may be supposed that the title, having been once introduced, gradually gained currency throughout the whole Christian community ; and even the pillars of the Jerusalem church may not have disdained to borrow from the youthful heretic a phrase so well calculated to exalt their common Master and Lord. At all events, the fact remains that in the recorded writings and discourses of the Galilean apostles, Jesus is called the Son of God once for twenty-nine times that the phrase occurs in all the Epistles of Paul, and that to the Hebrews, to say nothing of its frequent repetition in the Johannine writings.

It remains for us now to say a few words as to what we conceive to have been the real origin and import of what is now the most distinguishing title of Jesus Christ. We do not deny that there are passages in the Old Testament which, according as the sufferings and the glory of the Saviour more and more appeared to be prefigured in the ancient Scriptures, might have given occasion at last to fix upon him the title of the Son of God ; and this title would certainly be considered more appropriate in proportion as men were accustomed to think of him as standing at the right hand of the Almighty, and as the future Judge of the world. Whoever first applied to Christ the words of the

* Rev. ii. 18.

† Ib. i. 13—15.

‡ Ib. i. 13, and xiv. 14.

§ Ib. i. 5, iii. 14.

|| Ib. v. 5.

Psalm, which were afterwards repeated in the gospel account of the baptism, went far towards securing the reception of the new title of honour; and although it would perhaps be claiming more minute accuracy for the book of Acts than most critics would be inclined to accord, if we were to assert upon its authority that Paul was the first who made this application, it is not without significance that the words in question are attributed only to him. There is at least no evidence that they were at any earlier period distinctly applied to Christ;* and as we have already shewn that the title "Son of God" did not originate with the Galilean apostles, it can hardly have sprung up from any Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Admitting that Paul was its originator, the alternative no doubt remains, that he may have drawn it either from the Greek or the Hebrew side of his culture; but how is it possible that he should have found it in the Scriptures of his forefathers without some hint from abroad, if his brother apostles had failed to do so? On the other hand, if the phrase were once introduced from a different source, any Scripture passage which seemed to favour its use would readily suggest itself.

Paul, we are convinced, drew his doctrine of the Son of God, together with the language which expressed it, not from a Hebrew, but from a Greek source. In saying this, we are not unmindful that the great apostle's faith was the fruit of his own inward experience—the result of a revelation of God's grace to his spiritual nature. We speak here only of the *form*. And in order to make the form intelligible, it is necessary to repeat here a statement already made, that Christianity is a union of two elements, viz. Hebrew religion and Greek philosophy. This union, it is well known, before it was consummated in the Greek forms of Christianity, had begun in Alexandria. There the Hebrew

* It is true that, in the prayer of the Jerusalem church (Acts iv. 25), the opening words of the second Psalm, where the very word *Messiah* occurs, are referred to the circumstances of the Christian church; and from this it would, no doubt, have been easy and natural to pass on to the seventh verse, and regard it also as *Messianic*. That this application is not made depends perhaps on its inappropriateness to the matter in hand. Even if it were made, however, it would be no compensation for the absence of the words "Son of God" as a *Messianic title*. The reader will bear in mind that we have been arguing all along simply against the received notion that these words were a recognized epithet of the Messiah among the Jews.

Scriptures were first made accessible to the Greek world. There Philo spent his life in the attempt to reconcile Moses and Plato, the teachings of revelation with the highest results of heathen wisdom. There, too, or at least under the influence of the ideas which emanated thence, were produced two of the most valuable compositions belonging to the early Christian literature—the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of St. John. This is not the place to enter at length into the Jewish-Alexandrine philosophy, nor is it necessary for our purpose that we should do so. It will be sufficient to notice briefly its leading feature. The grand principle upon which it turned was the distinction between God as the Absolute Being and God as revealed in creation. Philo taught that God in His essence was entirely beyond the reach of human knowledge, unapproachable, unintelligible. The philosopher, we must suppose, had looked down the vast abyss of Being until whatever seemed to have any connection with the partial or the finite vanished away, and there remained only the pure essence of Deity, without attributes, without even a name. How to connect the Absolute Being, notwithstanding, with the world and with man, was the problem of his school. The solution of this problem, no doubt, involved a contradiction; but the contradiction perhaps was not so obvious when extended through many volumes as it becomes when set down in one paragraph. The Absolute Being, having no relationship to anything, was nevertheless made known to man and connected with the material world by his Word or Logos. The Logos was the Mediator, the Creator, the High Priest of the world, the Image of God. He stood in the most intimate relation to the human soul, and was the guardian and giver of virtue. He was the first begotten of God, and himself the second God. He was also the Son of God, and was distinguished as the elder Son from the Cosmos, which was the younger Son. It is not always clear whether in Philo's view the Logos is a person; but we believe there is no doubt that he was so regarded in his relation of Mediator between God and the world. He seems, however, to have sustained another character, in which the outlines of personality fade off into metaphysical abstraction. The Logos was also the Idea of ideas, the most universal idea; present, therefore, according to the realistic philosophy of the time, in all

things. In this sense the Word would be the permanent ground of existing things, as well as their original Creator, and the only substantial reality amid a world ever fluctuating and changeful. Nor are these two characters very far apart. The unknown substance in which phenomena inhere, endowed with personality, is He who creates and enfolds and sustains all things. This is not merely the doctrine of Philo, but of all true philosophy.

Such, then, was the leading doctrine of the Alexandrine school, taught by Philo before Christianity was ever heard of, and pretty widely diffused while Jesus Christ was still upon earth. That far more affinities with this school of thought are to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Johannine writings than in the letters of Paul, is an unquestionable fact. And it may also be considered certain that the Logos was not identified with the person of Christ earlier than the second century. Nevertheless, the future apostle of the Gentiles must have passed some portion of his life within the same circle of ideas as the Alexandrine philosopher, and breathing the same intellectual atmosphere. That atmosphere, in fact, can hardly have been less than co-extensive with the diffusion of the Greek translation of the Scriptures, and must have included in its embrace and supplied with nourishment all Greek-speaking Jews. It would naturally be a long time before an entirely new order of ideas could marry itself to the great spiritual influence which was coming out of Palestine; but it would be nothing strange if a mind of such vigour as Paul's carried into the pre-existing system a doctrine which it was prepared to receive, or even gave to those who rejected the doctrine a mode of expression which they had not before employed. "The Son of God," then, was an Alexandrine term; it was Greek; it never became Hebrew; but Christianity in passing from the Hebrew to the Greek world adopted it, and endowed it with a new meaning.

The Pauline doctrine of the Son of God seems to us to be not unlike Philo's doctrine of the Logos in some of its most important features. Paul had learned from the Alexandrine philosophy that the Absolute God, the Father of all, was revealed through his Son, and that the Son is the principle of life. In becoming a Christian, he adopted the belief that the expected Messiah had appeared upon earth

in humble guise in the person of Jesus, that he had been rejected by his countrymen and crucified, and that, having been received into heaven, he was now at the right hand of God, and would presently appear in divine power and glory. His conversion, however, was a spiritual change, by which he became aware of a life within him deeper than his own, of a divine righteousness delivering him from the burden of the Law, and enabling him, through a self-crucifixion, in which he shared the sufferings of his Lord, to triumph over sin and death. If there is anything clear in the writings of Paul, it is that he felt his own soul, and the souls of others, to be secure only so far as they were anchored in a Divine Life which both was and was not a part of themselves. There was the "I" of self, and the "I" which was "not I."* The believer had a double consciousness, and his faith was complete only so far as his own life was taken up and absorbed in a higher, in the life of the Son of God. Such was clearly the faith of the apostle—a faith strong, vivid, intense. It needed only to reconcile it intellectually with the Christian hope and the Greek philosophy. The Son of God in Paul's theology occupied very much the same place as the Logos in the system of Philo. He was the universal ground of life, at least in all believers, dwelling in every heart, and mediating everlastingly between God and the world. In this light he might be compared to the Logos as the Idea of ideas. But the Son of God was beyond all cavil a person; or, if he had not been previously, he had become so in Jesus Christ, and would remain so for ever. The faith of Paul was intensely personal, and the image of Jesus on the cross seemed to him the most perfect embodiment of Divine Love. It was not felt to be inconsistent with this spiritual union of the Son of God with the soul of the believer, to transfer his more open manifestation to a future time, and to look forward with the elder apostles to the glorious appearing of the Lord Jesus. But the expectation of a second coming of Christ, which was common to the whole Christian Church, and which undoubtedly appears in the Epistles of Paul, was in him entirely subordinate to that living faith in a present Saviour which was

* Gal. ii. 20. These words we regard as the key to the whole Pauline theology.

the great characteristic of his mind, as well as the source of his power. No one, we think, can read the letters of the great apostle, especially those to the Galatians and Romans, without feeling that this is so. Not faith in a Messiah who had come and gone and would by and by return, but personal union with the life of the Son of God was the principle of the Pauline Christianity.

It is quite clear to us that with Paul at least the "Son of God" was no mere synonym of the Messiah. The two ideas were no doubt indissolubly blended in his consciousness; but they are not on that account quite beyond the scope of critical analysis. The very relation in which Paul stood towards the Church—the relation in which he claims to have stood towards Christ as the recipient of an immediate revelation—of itself renders it more probable that he brought with him his characteristic doctrine, together with the phrase which most fully embodies it, rather than received them at the hands of those to whom he would acknowledge no debt. If indeed he had proceeded, like the elder apostles, from love for the human Jesus, upwards to trust in a heavenly Saviour, he must have found the title of Son of God ready to his hand, or else he could never have used it at all: but if, as we know was actually the case, he carried *down* this trust from heaven to the earth, and found in Jesus simply the historical manifestation of that divine Son of God whom he had learned to know as the very principle of all true life, then he must needs have brought with him into Christianity a foreign idea, and with it a name hitherto unknown. It may indeed seem strange that Paul should have appropriated a phrase which is used but sparingly by Philo, and not have adopted the term *Logos*, which is of constant recurrence in the writings of the Alexandrine philosopher. But this may have been caused by circumstances of which we are ignorant. We are not of course maintaining any direct contact between the apostle and Philo. We only say that the fundamental principle of the Jewish-Alexandrine philosophy was widely diffused in the years preceding the conversion of Paul, and formed a part of the intellectual life of the time. And when this principle was brought into connection with Christianity, the particular term which Paul adopted may have seemed better suited than any other to express the media-

tion by which man was brought into connection with the Infinite. And at *this* point, though not before, it may be considered certain that the Jewish Scriptures came in, and fixed upon the Messiah the title which it is hardly possible they should have originated.

Here, then, we close our case. We claim to have shewn with a strong degree of probability, that the title of Son of God was not applied to Jesus Christ during his life, or previous to the conversion of the apostle Paul; and with a less degree of probability, that the title was introduced by Paul, and was derived by him from that circle of ideas of which Alexandria was the birth-place and home. Let us here give a brief synopsis of the arguments we have adduced.

1. The Old Testament contains only one passage which could have suggested the title of Son of God as a designation of the Messiah, and there is no evidence that this one passage was interpreted by the Jews in a Messianic sense.

2. There is no evidence, apart from that furnished by the Gospels, that the Son of God was a familiar Messianic title.

3. Even in the Gospels it does not appear as a familiar title; for it is always introduced under circumstances which justify suspicions of the historical accuracy of the passages where it occurs; and there is a mystery attending its use which does not belong to the undoubted Messianic title of the Son of David.

4. The remaining books of the New Testament are entirely in favour of this view, with the exception of one passage in the Revelation, which, however (as we have shewn), is not fatal to it.

5. The term "Son of God" with Paul expressed an idea unknown to Jewish Christianity. The idea and the term both belonged to the Jewish-Alexandrine philosophy; and the culture of Paul was not so remote from this school as to render it unlikely that he may have been partly indebted to it for both.

These are our arguments. On the other side, so far as we are aware, is all orthodox and heterodox authority.

R. B. DRUMMOND.

II.—THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

SIXTY YEARS furnish fair evidence of the value attaching to a public Society. It will have shewn its spirit and developed its capabilities within that time. The British and Foreign Bible Society has existed so long; and though it does not enter now on a new career, it may be well to notice the chief incidents in its history, and the extent to which it has carried out the broad principles it was founded upon. The idea that led to its formation originated with Mr. Hughes, a Baptist minister, who suggested a general circulation of the Scriptures, as an enlargement of the Rev. Thos. Charles's proposal of a contribution to aid in printing and distributing Welsh Bibles. This same preacher prepared an Address, with the title, "The Excellence of the Holy Scriptures, and an Argument for their more General Diffusion," A.D. 1803; whose circulation was the precursor of a public meeting held at the London Tavern, relative to the formation of the proposed Society, on the 7th of March, 1804. A few speeches introduced the adoption of a series of resolutions. The foundation laid by the worthy men who met on that occasion is simple and catholic. They say that—

"The sole object of the Society shall be to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures; the only copies in the languages of the United Kingdom to be circulated by the Society shall be the Authorized Version, without note or comment; and that it shall add its endeavours to those employed by other Societies for circulating the Scriptures through the British dominions; and shall also, according to its ability, extend its influence to other countries, whether Christian, Mahometan or Pagan."

It is a curious fact that the rudiments of the Society were Dissenting rather than Church of England. But the Dissenting element soon gave way to a higher and abler one. Seven-twelfths of the Committee were assigned to the Church of England and foreign churches; only five being left for the members of the Church of Scotland and the numerous classes of Dissenters, Methodists, &c., throughout the United Kingdom. The bone and sinews of the Society are Established Church, and were so almost from the beginning. Nor has any reasonable complaint been advanced against

this arrangement, since the Association could not have become a great organization otherwise.

The history of the Society shews a steady increase of funds, as well as of influence and acceptance among all classes. The infant has become a giant, stretching forth wide arms to embrace Europe, Asia and Africa, with their numerous islands. It excited an interest at once in some parts of Germany, especially at Nuremberg, as well as in Scotland and Wales ; so that the first Report, dated 1805, records the receipt of no less than £5592. 10s. 5d. From the beginning till February 1816, five hundred and fifty-nine auxiliary societies and branches, independently of Bible Associations, were formed within the British dominions ; and in the same period, the Society printed the Scriptures, or aided in their printing and circulation in part or in whole, in sixty-three different languages and dialects. Nearly £400,000 had been received at that time. The Society's Jubilee was celebrated in 1853, when the net receipts for the year were £109,160 ; £66,000 being contributed for a Jubilee Fund.

In the Sixty-first Report, dated 1865, the receipts from ordinary sources are given as upwards of £180,000. The number of versions in various languages and dialects printed or assisted by the Society is stated to be two hundred and nine. The auxiliaries, branches and associations in Great Britain amount to 3894 ; those in the colonies and other dependencies to 1154. The very Report of the Society shews the magnitude of its operations, since an abstract of the proceedings for a single year fills an octavo volume of 490 pages.

The history of the Institution exhibits few striking or remarkable incidents. Prosperity has marked its progress. Possessing a comprehensive basis, it has commended itself to the approbation and excited the active sympathy of the majority of Church-going Protestants in the British islands. Its career resembles that of a respectable, dignified gentleman pursuing a steady course, looking around him for new spheres of action, helping the weak, giving money to the needy, and stirring up the slothful to work in the same direction with himself ; humble in profession, though tolerably self-complacent at times, praising God without forgetting self. But as few public-spirited individuals manage to pass through the world without meeting obstruction or

adversity, some things have disturbed the managers of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Even the Presidentship of a nobleman has not saved his favourite from attack or violence.

The first opponent of note was one of the Divinity Professors belonging to Cambridge University, the Rev. Herbert Marsh, subsequently Bishop of Peterborough, who printed an Address to the members of the Senate of the University in 1811, recommending all Churchmen to withdraw from it and adhere to the old Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Believing that the Prayer-book should be circulated with the Bible, he was averse to the union of Churchmen with Dissenters. An answer was drawn up by Lord Bexley, the President, temperate in tone and appropriate; and the Professor wrote again. Mr. Simeon and the Dean of Carlisle also took up their pens on the side of the Society. The learned translator of Michaelis was no mean antagonist; yet he failed to produce any perceptible effect. A less noted champion on the same side was Dr. Wordsworth, of Trinity College, Cambridge, in whose eyes it was a crime for Churchmen to unite with Dissenters for the execution of any purpose, however good.

The next disturbing wave that rolled over the Society was occasioned by a Preface or Introduction (1819) prefixed by Professor Haffner, of Strasburg, to an edition of Luther's version which the London Committee assisted by a grant of £500. The introductory remarks extended to thirty-seven pages, and were fastened upon by heresy-hunters as a subject of attack. To Scotchmen, in particular, they were exceedingly obnoxious, and were branded as an "infidel production." It was discovered that the author was a *Rationalist*, a name sufficiently odious to ignorant pietists. What were considered the worst sentences were industriously selected and printed, to discomfit the friends of the Bible Society and induce them to withhold both money and countenance from the version which the Introduction was intended to accompany. The heretical sentiments embodied in Professor Haffner's remarks are mild indeed. Though not conformed to the orthodox type, they are commonly just and correct. Thus he says of the Psalms: "Those of David contain the expression of various feelings which agitated him during his life. Some of the others are songs of war and victory,

which bear in some parts the impression of the yet imperfect moral sentiments of early times. David curses his enemies, Christ teaches us to pray for them. Others are moral or religious hymns." Again: "In Nehemiah we see what power a pious patriotism has over the minds of men."

Though these two passages figure among such as were chosen for reprobation by the accusers, it is difficult to see how common sense can object to them. It was not denied that Haffner believed in miracles; but having the misfortune to exercise his reason upon the contents of the Bible, he was called "an infidel" by Alexander Haldane and Co. In vain did that accomplished scholar Dr. Pye Smith characterize Haffner's Introduction as "an interesting and valuable performance." In vain did he protest against the injustice and falsehood of branding the writer as an *infidel*. In return for his charity, his paper in the Evangelical Magazine defending Haffner was stigmatized by Mr. Carson as "one of the most astonishing and detestable productions ever seen from the pen of a man professing strictly orthodox principles." In consequence of the obnoxious Preface, the London Committee sent forth an explanatory pamphlet; and Haffner's remarks were separated from the version, being sold only to those who wished for them, and not circulated along with the copies of Luther's translation printed by the Strasburg Bible Society. It is difficult to see how the Society were blameable in the matter, since they remonstrated as soon as they knew the fact. But it is *not* difficult to predict the fate of an unlucky orthodox Congregationalist at the present day, who should venture to defend Haffner's Preface, as Dr. Smith once did. He would be cast out of the synagogue as a heretic.

The most serious invasion of the Society's calm security was caused by the Apocryphal controversy. In January, 1825, the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society drew up a series of resolutions condemning the circulation of the Apocrypha by the Bible Society of London, or its aiding others to do so; and resolved that all remittances to the Parent Society should be suspended till a satisfactory answer was received. This step on the part of the Scottish friends led the Committee in London to pass a resolution, which has been embodied in each successive Report, to the following effect:

"That the funds of the Society be applied to the printing and circulation of the Canonical books of Scripture, to the exclusion of those books and parts of books which are usually termed Apocryphal; and that all copies, printed either entirely or in part at the expense of the Society, and whether such copies consist of the whole or of any one or more of such books, be invariably issued bound, no other books whatever being bound with them; and further, that all money grants to societies or individuals be made only in conformity with the principle of this regulation."

The resolution is explicit enough. Yet the Edinburgh Committee pronounced it "unsatisfactory," and issued two other statements, in 1826, declining to renew their co-operation with the British and Foreign Bible Society. The ingenuity and theological ability displayed in these pamphlets are remarkable. They were written wholly or chiefly by Dr. Andrew Thomson. But their spirit is intemperate and harsh. The controversy gave rise to a small library of controversial theology. Many champions took the field on both sides, and wielded their weapons with great vigour. Churchmen and Dissenters, Englishmen and Scotchmen, shewed their knowledge and acumen. Even ladies took up the pen; and the able letters of "Anglicanus" told upon the Scottish people. The extreme parties indulged in strong language. Thus the Edinburgh Bible Society state—

"That the British and Foreign Bible Society is not only altogether prohibited by the laws of its existence from giving any sanction to the circulation of the Apocrypha, but that it cannot do this without incurring the guilt of putting a most fearful fraud upon the world, and laying a deadly snare for the souls of men; because the Apocrypha is not only an uninspired book, and therefore on a level with other human productions, but far below the level of many human compositions, as it is abundantly interspersed with falsehoods, false doctrines, superstitions and contradictions of itself and of the Word of God; and because these Apocryphal writings, laden as they are with such gross and palpable error, do advance a deceitful claim to reverence and attention upon the pretext of their being inspired; so that in whatever degree the influence of the British and Foreign Bible Society has tended to encourage the circulation of these Apocryphal writings, it has gone out of its direct and legitimate course to give its sanction to a human composition replete with error, which wickedly assumes to be a revelation from heaven," &c.

An Appendix in this same pamphlet asserts that the

Apocryphal books "are replete with instances of vanity, flattery, idle curiosity, affectation of learning and other blemishes, with frivolous, absurd, false, superstitious and contradictory statements." Proofs of these charges are given in the shape of extracts from the books. But they fail to justify them. The ground taken is an untenable one; and though verses and sentences are industriously picked, it is easy to see that some are reluctantly dragged in to do duty. Perhaps the passage in 2 Maccabees xii. 43, 44, favouring prayers for the dead, has given most offence to the anti-apocryphists. We do not deny that several quotations from the books given by the Edinburgh Committee are objectionable in sentiment and unscriptural in spirit; nor that the Deutero-canonical writings are inferior in value and spiritual elevation to the Canonical ones. But parallels to various extracts from the Apocrypha, which are held up to reprobation, may be found in the Canonical books themselves. In trying to damage the former, these zealous purists tempt impartial men to damage the latter in the same way. An indictment against the Canonical books, not much inferior in strength or validity to that against the Apocryphal ones, could be drawn up by a competent critic. Well might the Rev. C. Simeon write, "For the Edinburgh Committee, who are endeavouring to spread dissension through the whole Society in all its branches and associations, there is no excuse."

But the crusade against the Apocrypha was not confined to a Committee. The redoubtable R. Haldane stepped forth in person to the fight, asserting, "Such is the anti-scriptural nature of these writings, so directly do they stand in opposition to the revelation of the grace of God, that if any man receives the doctrine they contain, and continues in that doctrine, he shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth in him." Again: "The Apocrypha is either an addition to the Holy Scriptures by God himself, or it is the work of lying prophets." In the same strain an anonymous pamphlet, published at Cambridge, entitled, "Twenty-one Reasons for not contributing to the Circulation of the Apocrypha," has these words: "By contributing directly or indirectly to the circulation of the Apocrypha, we become partakers of other men's sins." As writers on the anti-apocryphal side, the Rev. Mr. Gorham and Henry Drummond

were also conspicuous. The Edinburgh Christian Instructor too, Dr. Thomson's organ, uttered its thunders and denunciations against the apologists of the Bible Society in the matter. The phrases applied to the circulation of the Apocryphal along with the Canonical books are marvellous in their pungency. "A daring imputation on God's Word;" "a presumptuous invasion of consecrated ground;" "an adulteration;" "a corruption;" "a degradation;" "a counteraction of divine revelation;" "a crime bordering on blasphemy;"—all these were freely used. In the midst of such din, the Revds. H. Venn and Charles Simeon wrote temperately and judiciously; while twenty-six members of the University of Cambridge protested against the exclusion of the Apocrypha. Nor should the good service done to the cause of moderation and justice by Mr. Conder in the Eclectic Review for 1825, and by Mr. Orme in the Congregational Magazine for 1826, be forgotten. Mr. Conder put the question in its true light when he said, "The question is, whether we are justified in withholding the whole Bible where it appears to be called for, because foreign churches admit more books than we do into their canon. It is admitted that there is no inspired catalogue of the Canonical books. *Our own canon may possibly include books not inspired.*" The last sentence indicates a liberality which does credit to Dissenting literature in 1825. But it is a layman's. Would layman or minister belonging to the Congregational body write it now? We think not: if he did, a stigma of unsoundness would be put upon him.

What course the Parent Society would have adopted had the Scottish brethren abstained from raising the question, it is impossible to tell; but the latter exerted an important influence on all future proceedings, and affected the belief of many in this country respecting the Apocryphal books. The Society had never printed the Apocrypha for the people who would receive the Bible without it; and it is to be regretted that they should have ceased to print and circulate the Apocrypha along with the Canonical books among those who wished to have it. But they vacillated during the controversy, and shewed themselves unable to grapple with it. By yielding some of the ground, they proved their unfitness for such emergencies. They did not know the true merits of the case, or the proper place which criticism

assigns to the Deutero-canonical books. When we see the deference which writers on both sides paid to the observations on the Apocrypha contained in the editions of Horne's Introduction prior to the tenth, and read of inspired and uninspired *books*, it is obvious that the question is misapprehended. Inspiration can only be predicated of men, not books. Those who wrote the Apocryphal treatises were inspired as well as the authors of the Canonical ones—not all, indeed, in the same degree, though some of them were more highly inspired than a few of the Canonical writers. The author of the book of Wisdom was superior in spiritual knowledge to the authors of Esther and Ecclesiastes. No definite line of demarcation can be drawn between the Canonical and Deutero-canonical writings; nor was the canon ever considered *closed* in the sense that all books not in it proceeded from uninspired men. There are errors in both classes of books. Both contain evidences of fallibility in the writers. There are more errors, in proportion to the extent of the writings, in the Deutero-canonical than in the Canonical ones.

The resolution adopted in Earl Street alienated enlightened Romanists on the continent, among whom Leander Van Ess was a most efficient agent, who possessed abundant opportunities of circulating the Bible among the Catholics of Germany.

The whole controversy produced mischief by exciting angry passions and nourishing animosities which Christian men should suppress. "Like the blasted ears and lean kine of Pharaoh's dream, it has demolished and consumed much that was more precious than itself, leaving no fruit remaining by which any are gainers. The body is doomed to languish with its suffering members, and the wounds received in one contest enfeeble our energy in another." Such were the true words of Mrs. Grey in 1827.

A secession from the Parent Society took place in 1831, in which year a Provincial Committee having been formed in London, entered into correspondence with the Secretaries of the British and Foreign Bible Society, to induce them to separate in membership from persons "not acknowledging the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity." Since the Society would not alter its constitution, the "Trinitarian Bible Society" was founded, "on Christian principles," as the mem-

bers affirm. What are the operations of this daughter it is not worth while to inquire, as they are not likely to retard the liberal spirit of the age.

Although the Society does not circulate the Vulgate version in Great Britain, being restricted to the Authorized one, yet it disseminates versions made from the Vulgate in Roman Catholic countries, such as De Saci's French, Martini's Italian, Scio's Spanish, Pereira's Portuguese, &c. Protests against this procedure have been made from time to time. In 1855, a protest against disseminating such versions was presented to the Committee of the Society in London from the Plymouth auxiliary. The answer returned did not, however, satisfy them. Hence a number of pamphlets were published by C. E. Stuart and others: "The Bible and Versions of the Bible; or the Vulgate compared with the Original Scriptures," 1856; "Modern Translations of the Vulgate and the Bible Society," 1857; "A Protest against the Circulation of the Papal Latin Vulgate and its Versions by the Bible Society," 1857; "The Greek Septuagint, its Use in the New Testament examined," 1859; "The Bible and the Version of Lemaistre de Saci, by B. Pozzy, Pastor, with an Appendix by the Editors," 1859. In 1861, the Spanish translation of the Vulgate was also the subject of a small tract, the writer of which objected to the circulation of Scio's version.

These protests against the circulation of versions from the Vulgate on the continent chiefly proceed from persons of narrow beliefs, from Plymouth Brethren or those who sympathize with them in opinion. Anti-popish clergymen sometimes assist. The publications of Mr. Stuart are elaborate attacks on the Vulgate and other versions. The Latin of Jerome, according to that gentleman, is a most corrupt translation, full of mistakes and of adulterations of the truth designed to support Romish doctrines. His indictment against it is a heavy one. But it is strained and exaggerated. The stand-point of the critic is unfair. Many of the errors he instances are not errors at all; some are harmless. No ancient version is faultless; and the Vulgate is quite as good as the Septuagint, which the New-Testament writers quoted freely and even reasoned upon where it is wrong. One of Mr. Stuart's pamphlets deals with this point; but he fails to see the case clearly and muddles the question,

making bold assertions about the New-Testament citations from the LXX. which criticism rejects. We do not sympathize with those who blacken the character of the Vulgate for a purpose, since they suggest a comparison in various instances between it and the original. Will the latter stand your peculiar test, one is tempted to ask? It will not. Use the original Hebrew and Greek as you do the Vulgate; and you may apply like disparaging epithets to them. Here, as in other cases, the narrow-minded bigots who insist on their notions being God's truth, turn men of common sense away from the Bible, and make them sceptical. The arguments of Stuart, Hales and others, on that side of the question, are frivolous enough; such as, *The Word of God cannot be tampered with; since the errors of the Vulgate are the errors of the Church of Rome, we cannot confirm the members of that Church in these errors; and, Such a course makes Scripture a nullity.* If those who argue against the circulation of Catholic versions have no better reasons than these, they cannot expect a hearing. The Vulgate and the versions made from it are more acceptable to Roman Catholics than Protestant ones. The latter would not be used in the majority of instances, because they have the appearance of proselytism. Besides, the versions made from the Vulgate are faithful enough to give the general sense of Scripture. A knowledge of the way of salvation may be derived from them. It is therefore right and expedient to disseminate them in Catholic countries. We know that a long list of errors has been collected out of De Saci's version to shew its badness. Could not a long list of errors be gathered from the Authorized English one? Why do the purists not attempt to get a better English version? They never speak of a purer Hebrew or Greek text; nor do they raise the question of a better German version than Luther's. All their zeal partakes of an anti-popish hue; and therefore the versions made from the Vulgate are severely criticised.

We are glad to find that the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society have firmly resisted the endeavours of the agitators to induce them to cease disseminating well-known versions made from the Vulgate by Roman Catholics. In this respect they have shewn a wisdom and steadfastness deserving of commendation. The Trinitarian

Bible Society is the proper body for carrying out the scheme which would abandon De Sacy, Martini, Scio and Pereira, for others less acceptable to the peoples of France, Italy, Spain and Portugal. We believe, however, that the funds of that recent Association are not in a satisfactory state—a fact that must cripple their operations. Sectarian Societies are not favoured by the public.

The local habitation of the British and Foreign Bible Society being too small and inconvenient for its work, the foundation-stone of a new building has been recently laid by a member of the Royal Family, amid the gratulations of the Committee and their friends. Every patriotic Englishman must rejoice in the success of an Association whose fundamental principle is so wide as to embrace all that acknowledge the Bible to be divine and adapted to enlighten mankind.

But the Society is not all that it might be. Some things about it awaken regret, if not displeasure. It has come to be practically, and for all purposes, under the management of one party in the Church of England, and that not the most enlightened, certainly not the most tolerant one. How this result has happened, we need not inquire. The fact itself is plain. The members of the High-church and Broad-church parties, as they are styled, have not joined it. Probably no individual properly belonging to either of these takes any active interest in its operations. The two most learned men who have sat on the Episcopal Bench during the present century have stood aloof from it; the Bishop of Peterborough having even been an open enemy, and the Bishop of St. David's name being absent from the list of Vice-presidents. Nor do we observe the names of Milman and Stanley and Jowett scattered over that page of the Report which contains so many Low-church Bishops. Since Marsh's time, one Bishop at least has appeared in print against the Society; we mean the late Bishop Denison of Salisbury, who published various reasons why he could not be a member. When men of learning, intellect and ability, stand aloof, the causes of their estrangement should be sought out, and removed if possible. The credit of the Society would surely be increased by the culture and talents of the Church generally. It is most desirable that fair representatives of all the parties in the Established Church

should be found in the Committee. A few orthodox Dissenters appear annually at the great gathering of the Society's friends ; and a few Methodists, too, appear on these occasions ; but they are all of one and the same school of belief, merely serving to give a colour to the carrying out of the broad principle on which the Society professes to be built.

Doubtless the comprehension of Dissenters by the Society, and its ostensible concession to them of a share in the management and speechifying, looks well in the eyes of the public ; but the secret and real strength of the body is all the while in the hands of a small section of the Church of England, which has tact enough to persuade the unthinking multitude that they circulate the *pure Word of God*, and so far stem the tide of neology, infidelity, Romanism and Socinianism, which runs swift and strong in these latter days. The idea of a Society which has the Earl of Shaftesbury for its President influencing either educated or thinking men for good, is preposterous. Religion must assume another form than that in which it comes from him to attract taste, right feeling, catholicity or simple-mindedness. The control of the concern belonging to one section of the Church, that which claims to be Evangelical, though at the same time the most intolerant, ignorant and bigoted, detracts from the breadth of its foundation.

Perhaps the speeches made at its annual meetings and on other occasions have tended to estrange the minds of some. As the Society does not profess to be a "religious" one, the orations of its advocates should be divested of doctrinal statements. But they are not. Often injudicious, intemperate in spirit, dogmatic in tone, they offend rather than conciliate. Every public measure relating to the Bible, and any theological book that excites general attention, are usually introduced for remark, oftener for rebuke, at the annual meetings. Thus when notice was given in the House of Commons for a Commission to prepare a new translation of the Bible in the year 1856, the Chairman took occasion to stigmatize the proposed measure as "one of the most subtle, but one of the most tremendous, dangers that now beset true religion." "This," said the noble Lord, "is the greatest danger that now threatens us ; it is pressed upon us from Germany ; it is pressed upon us by the neological spirit of the age. I hold it to be far more dangerous than

Tractarianism or Popery, both of which I abhor from the bottom of my heart." When the speaker proclaimed at the same meeting, "This is the greatest, the best, the noblest Society now existing in this country," surely Demetrius the silversmith occurred to the mind of some shrewd listener.

The Essays and Reviews were also a text for some time, and the sermons of the Society upon it were far from edifying. They may have gratified the speakers' self-esteem, and been a safety-valve by which they let off their poisonous gas, but they did not contribute to charity. Next came Bishop Colenso, whose volumes on the Pentateuch were lustily reviled by men zealous for the truth, not for God's truth, desirous to be on the popular side, ignorant of Hebrew but all the more qualified on that account to sit in judgment on questions which only able scholars can thoroughly understand. "We do not know," said the Chairman in 1863, "what the Society has been doing in South Africa, but we know what South Africa has been doing in England" (whereat the multitude laughed); "and I maintain that this puerile and ignorant attack on the sacred and unassailable Word of God," &c. So, too, the Archbishop of York: "Long after this new arithmetic has gone to that oblivion which it has done its very utmost to deserve," &c. Is it dignified in a great Society to shoot forth its arrows from right honourable, episcopal and reverend bows, against theological essays and critical books? We could produce shafts whose venom grates against the finer feelings of humanity, or rather against the spirit of the great Master. May not some learned Churchmen have also been alienated by theological doctrines propounded in the speeches—doctrines about which the opinions of scholarly men are divided? Thus a Bishop, speaking at the fifty-first anniversary, said, "Every part and portion and sentence of the book is inspired and is the Word of God;" and to the same effect another clerical gentleman asserted with vehemence in 1856, "Every word, yea, every letter, in God's written record is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, because given by the inspiration of the Spirit of Truth." Is it judicious in the Society to endorse sentiments opposed to those of Her Majesty's Privy Council, the highest court of appeal to which the Established Church can go?

A great body which deals with the Scriptures in many

languages should be anxious to procure the best texts. In this respect the Committee are remiss—more so now than formerly; for when Dr. Henderson appealed to the Bible Society in 1824 respecting the gross errors in Ali Bey's Turkish version of the New Testament, printed at Paris in 1819 and adopted for circulation, Prof. Lee, Mr. Renouard and other scholars were consulted about it. The former wrote a book containing remarks on Henderson's appeal; to which the latter replied with effect in 1825. We also know that the Committee availed themselves at various times of the co-operation of respectable scholars, such as Adam Clarke, T. Pell Platt, &c., besides Dr. Henderson their own agent, and Prof. Lee. It is to be feared that the counsels and aid of scholars are little sought by the managers of the Society in recent times. Nor are their agents abroad quite equal in learning and talents to such as were once employed. Where have they a man of the same knowledge and acquirements as the late Dr. Henderson, who served them efficiently? In proportion as the Society has fallen into the hands of a party in the Church of England, or rather the section of a party which possesses the least biblical scholarship, in the same degree will the operations of the body present the character of a dull monotony fatal to new life and adverse to the advancing criticism of the day, which requires better texts of the Scripture and its versions, as well as another mode of interpreting them. How long is it since the Society has sanctioned D'Allemand's revision of Van der Hooght's Hebrew Bible, when a much more correct one, that of Theile, is before the public? Why have they not got a better text of the Peshito Syriac than Lee's, since ancient Nitrian MSS. are available, and better Syriac scholars than Lee, such as Ceriani, are at work in the same department? Why is the Greek *textus receptus* alone sold in Earl Street? Some literary infusion into the Society is highly desirable at the present time. Let us have less of the shop; less solicitude about making money by selling so many thousand Bibles every year, and more about good texts. "The pure, unadulterated Word of God," is a stock phrase among the Society's speechifiers; why do they not endeavour to get a nearer approach to it, instead of stereotyping and selling in their "pure Word of God" the statement that *Saul was one year old* when he began to reign?

(1 Sam. xiii. 1). We regret that biblical learning has so little place in the esteem of the Committee. Is there a single scholar about the house in Earl Street whose name is known in the world of letters? Even a creed is necessary to the official post of Editorial Superintendent, the creed implied in being *evangelical*, an epithet having a distinctive meaning among the authorities. This creed is put above knowledge, learning and competent qualification. The deficiency of literature appears in the very Reports, which are badly written, consisting of dry statistics ill digested, of high-sounding platitudes and self-laudatory twaddle such as,

“Why is it, your Committee are ready to ask—it is a question which has doubtless arisen in many a thoughtful mind—why at this particular juncture is the Society placed in a position of unsurpassed vigour and strength? Why are there vouchsafed to it at the present moment such abundant resources? Is the ploughshare of war to break up new furrows in which the seed of the Kingdom may be cast? Are woes coming down upon the earth which nothing but the healing waters of the sanctuary can soothe? It is not an easy conquest, peradventure, that lies before us; for many foes are still marshalled, and watching to resist the onward and majestic march of truth; but let us rejoice that it is nevertheless a certain conquest,” &c.

Self-laudation and bad writing are too common in the Reports. But one of the Secretaries is usually taken from the ranks of those who have received no university education, and may be illiterate. We do not aver that such education ensures good writing, or that the want of it is a proper test of the ability to write well; but in the absence of literature, the capacity to write respectably should be a condition of Secretaryship.

The unbiassed opinion of competent judges as to the Society's operations in several countries is not very favourable. To mention but one. Many intelligent persons in Germany believe that if the money which the Society spends there in Bibles were given for educational purposes, it would be better applied. The Germans themselves have the same version of the Scriptures as that which the British and Foreign Bible Society circulates. But they are attached to Luther's in the state the great Reformer left it in, *with the Apocryphal books*. The Canstein Bible Institution at Halle has printed millions of copies of this version. Why then

try to lessen the influence of the German Societies that print Luther's version, by selling the very same *minus* the Apocrypha at a cheaper rate, through the aid of English money? And do the Society's agents in Germany suppose that the way to extinguish so-called Rationalism is to circulate Luther's version without the Apocrypha, as Dr. Pinkerton argued? If they do, they are greatly mistaken. Tholuck himself, who knows Rationalism as well as any man, repudiates the notion. Other biblical scholars still more famous agree with him. In fact, none but a thorough-going bibliolater can think so. The Bible understood and explained may be an antidote to infidelity; the book alone, in the hands of ordinary readers, will not extirpate error. It may even create error in the mind, unless it be rightly interpreted. It is good to put a copy of the Scriptures within the reach of the poorest man who can read, for they contain the words of eternal life; but their leading message to man must be believed and acted upon, if he be really brought near to God.

S. D.

III.—CHARACTERISTICS OF ROMAN CATHOLIC PIETY.

1. *Eugénie de Guérin, Journal et Fragments, &c.* Dix-septième édition. Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie Française. Paris: Didier. 1866.
2. *Lettres d'Eugénie de Guérin, &c.* Neuvième édition. Paris: Didier. 1866.
3. *Maurice de Guérin, Journal, Lettres et Poèmes, &c.* Neuvième édition. Paris: Didier. 1866.
4. *Anne Paule Dominique de Noailles, Marquise de Montagu.* Cinquième édition. Paris: Dentu. 1866.

It has become something very like a truism to say that, although there are many forms of Christian Faith, there is but one Christian Life, and that those who cannot see eye to eye in regard to the authority of a creed or the claims of a church, may find a basis of agreement in their necessarily accordant conceptions of love and duty. Nor would

we willingly utter a word that could be understood to impair, in even the slightest degree, the width and force of a principle which, in these days of perpetually hotter discord, is beginning to be discerned as the true hope of the Church. If, in the last resort, Perfect Holiness and Absolute Truth stand in an analogous rather than a contrasted relation to human striving—so that the noblest life as feebly represents the moral perfectness of God, as the truest belief the impenetrable mystery of His nature and will—the weakness lies *here* in conception, *there* in action, and men may agree to reverence a nobler ideal than they can individually realize. But in contemplating this oneness of the Christian life, which stands out the more boldly from its contrast with the multiplicity of Christian beliefs, it is possible to overlook the fact that within certain limits there is a variation in the religious ideal of churches. Every form of faith, it may be said, gives special prominence to some single truth, for which, by the very process of isolation and exaggeration, it preserves a place in the great cycle of doctrine; so that to collect the whole mind of Christ it would be necessary to go the round of all the churches. Much more is this the case with the life of God, as far as it is capable of being reflected in the life of man. The fruits of the Spirit are not without an individual flavour, according as they are grown in this or that garden of the soul. There are well-marked distinctions between a Protestant and a Catholic holiness. The same fact is to be observed within narrower limits: it is easy to distinguish between a High-churchman and an Evangelical, though neither utter a single party shibboleth; and a Methodist strangely differs from any other species of Nonconformist. These differences of character are subtle, difficult to define, still more difficult, without great risk of mistake or exaggeration, to express; but, for all that, not the less real. And perhaps it is only from the compared and contrasted saintliness of all the saints, that it is possible to attain the conception of what moral perfectness lies within the reach of human faculties.

The books which we have enumerated at the head of this article afford an opportunity of investigating part of this somewhat neglected subject. The *Journal and Letters of Eugénie de Guérin* have already found a home in England; the *Biography of Madame de Montagu*, which, after having

been circulated in private among the friends and connections of her family, has now been warmly received by a larger circle of readers, is less well known. The life of Madlle. de Guérin is absolutely without incident, as the word is commonly understood ; that of Madame de Montagu is involved with one of the most terrible tragedies of the French Revolution : the reader is almost inclined to pity, in the former case, a fine mind condemned to so dull a monotony of fate ; in the latter, to lament that so much of suffering and struggle should have been crowded into one poor human life. But in both cases the nobleness of character, produced under a discipline of circumstance so diverse, was unmistakeably Catholic. Neither Eugénie de Guérin nor Pauline de Noailles could for a moment be supposed to have been the subjects of Protestant training. Sweet and noble as their characters are, the odour of the incense is upon them ; and the rosary is visible through the robes of their saintliness.

We are absolved from the necessity of describing at length the character of Eugénie de Guérin, by the recent translation of her *Journal and Letters* into English, and still more by the charming sketch of her life and writings given by Mr. Matthew Arnold to the numerous readers of the *Cornhill Magazine*.* Yet a word or two in this place may be needful to explain what follows. She was the daughter of a gentleman of Languedoc, the head of an ancient and noble, but decayed family, which in times long past had counted among its members Cardinals and Chancellors of France, Troubadours and Grand Masters of Malta. Her father cultivated his little paternal estate of Le Cayla, where he maintained a half-feudal, half-patriarchal position among the neighbouring peasantry. Her mother died while she was quite a girl ; her elder brother, Erembert, lived the usual life of a country gentleman in southern France ; her sister Marie, belying the promise of her name, was the careful, cheerful housewife of the family. Maurice, the youngest child, was first Eugénie's darling, then her friend, correspondent, idol, saint. He was sent to school at Toulouse at an early age, apparently with a view of being educated for the Church ; then transferred to the College Stanislas at Paris ; and next, when

* Vol. VII. p. 784.

about twenty-two, joined a religious society which the famous Lamennais was gathering around him at La Chênaie, in Brittany. When, after a few months, this little company was dispersed by the fear and jealousy of the ecclesiastical authorities, he betook himself to Paris, where he earned a scanty subsistence by giving lessons and writing articles. His vocation for the Church, if ever he had any, was gone ; and without shaking off the moral restraints of Christianity, he gradually, like so many more intellectual Frenchmen, slid away from its open profession. Four or five years of obscure and ill-rewarded labour, during which he did not so much accomplish anything, as indicate to appreciative eyes what under happier circumstances he might have accomplished, ended his brief and melancholy life. He had just been married to a young Creole, whose fortune relieved him from pecuniary anxieties, and whose affection might have given him the repose of mind which he needed for sustained effort, when consumption laid its hand upon him, and he returned to Le Cayla to die. He was only twenty-nine. Eugénie, from whose life the light went out at her brother's death, survived him by nine years, when she too gradually passes from the reader's sight, one hardly knows how. The great object of this last period of her life, the publication of her brother's journal and remains, she failed to accomplish. But the good time was coming ; first Madame George Sand, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, then M. Sainte Beuve, drew public attention to the young poet, who had promised so much, yet achieved so little ; and the volume which we have placed at the head of this article, due to the pious care of M. Trebutien, received a warm welcome. But the brother and sister, one in life, could not be divided in death ; and Maurice, for whom Eugénie had lived, repaid the debt by becoming the unconscious occasion of her fame. For him, whom the distance of Le Cayla from Paris and the narrow circumstances of the family detained for long years from his beloved home, she kept a journal, in which she noted down, not only the news of the chateau and the harmless gossip of the village, but her own thoughts and fancies. No title could better describe this journal than that under which Goethe has embodied the experience of *Fraülein von Klettenberg* in *Wilhelm Meister* ; it is emphatically "The Confessions of a Fair Soul." The allu-

sions made to it by Maurice de Guérin in his own diary and letters, awakened the curiosity of his friends and admirers. It was published; was crowned by the French Academy; has already run through seventeen editions; and has carried along with its wave of popularity a volume of Letters almost as delightful as itself. Henceforth Maurice and Eugénie de Guérin have a place in French literature of which they cannot be deprived; and there is this peculiarity about their conjoint fame (one cannot help thinking that they would willingly have had it so), that each in part owes it to the other.

With Maurice de Guérin we have in this connection little to do. A few letters to his friends, a journal largely devoted to self-questioning, and one or two poems, make up the volume of his remains. The most noticeable quality of his mind appears to be an intense sympathy with the varying aspects of nature, which he observes with singular accuracy and describes in vivid and picturesque phrase. Like Keats (though Keats had actually accomplished far more), he leaves behind him the impression of immature powers which might have ripened into almost indefinite strength and grace. His sister's literary abilities are less distinguished, yet altogether healthier and more complete. No life could well be conceived more monotonous than hers; she paid one long visit to Paris upon occasion of her brother's wedding, and made a journey or two into the north and centre of France; but all the rest was spent in the seclusion of Le Cayla. An English damsel in the same station of life would order more books from Mudie in three months than formed her whole library; and certainly, fresh from the excitement of fashionable novels, would scorn to open most of those which Eugénie enumerates as among her scanty store. The vintage and the crops, a village birth and a village death, a new curé, a visit to Alby or Rayssac, the thousand petty incidents of country life,—these, and the impressions which they make upon her, are her constant topics. Yet the reader is never weary. He, too, learns to love Le Cayla; to know the familiar figures of the household; to watch for the dear letter from Paris, long looked for; to take pleasure in the rustic festivities of Christmas, and to drink in with delight the first warm breath of spring. These trifling pleasures, this monotony of avocation, this

narrow round of interests, are transfigured in the glow of pure human sympathy ; they are no longer poor and common when interpreted by a vivid imagination and a tender heart.

Eugénie de Guérin is a Catholic of the Catholics. Not a germ of what in the theological sense would be called *liberal* feeling can be detected in her. It may be questioned whether a Protestant who had casually met her in society might not have been deterred from the attempt to penetrate her character by the exclusively Catholic setting of her life. M. de Guérin and his two daughters appear in every word and action as uncompromising adherents of the Church ; Eugénie herself not only is regular, to an exemplary degree, in her attendance upon all religious ordinances, but yields herself up, with a sincerity not to be mistaken, to the guidance of her confessor. Her constant and absorbing anxiety is that Maurice, during his Parisian life, should have abandoned the devout usages of Le Cayla ; her deepest joy that he died with the wafer upon his lips, the sacred oil upon his brow. She has no sympathy with even such modified divergence from Catholicism as that of Lamennais ; nor can her brother's influence induce her to regard him as anything but a presumptuous rebel against the Pope, for whom prompt suppression is true mercy. She wears a medal as a preservative against cholera ; and when Maurice comes home to die, she writes to Prince Hohenlohe, asking him, with most undoubting faith, to work a miracle of healing on their behalf. And yet, notwithstanding all this, the piety which glows in her journal and letters is not only simple, ardent, pure, but almost wholly monotheistic. She reads the lives of the Saints with naive credulity, but here at least she records no prayers to them. She thinks the dedication of the month of May to the Virgin a touching and beautiful custom, but there is hardly a trace of Mariolatry upon her pages. Her diary, in which she notes down her most secret thoughts, has infinitely less of Christ-worship in it than the devotional works of many Protestants, who would look down upon her superstition from a scornful height of enlightenment. May it not be that, although there is a marked divergence in the form of Catholic and Protestant faith, they agree in this, that the noblest piety, nourished by whatever creed, always flies instinctively to the noblest object, and will be satisfied

with no meaner goal of its aspirations than the Infinite God?

We turn now for a while to the less familiar form of Madame de Montagu. Anne Paule Dominique de Noailles, known before her marriage as Madlle. de Maintenon, was fourth among the five daughters of the Duc d'Ayen, the eldest son of the last Maréchal de Noailles. She was born at Paris, on the 22nd of June, 1766. Of her father, who was a courtier, though of the nobler stamp, she saw little till her childhood was passed. Her mother, "brought up at first in a convent, afterwards in the house of her father, M. d'Aguesseau, which was as grave and orderly as a convent, loved nothing so well as retirement, and carried into her piety, together with the ardour of her fine nature, somewhat of Jansenist austerity. In some respects she might have been compared to La Mère Angelique of Port Royal, if La Mère Angelique had lived in the world and learned the lessons of its experience."* Madame d'Ayen herself superintended the education of her daughters, not only cultivating to good purpose their naturally fine minds, but impressing upon them a deep and ardent religiousness. They all married at an early age. The eldest became the Vicomtesse de Noailles; the second, the wife of the Marquis de la Fayette, the companion of Washington, and, what in this connection is perhaps more characteristic, the prisoner of Olmütz. The third daughter married the Vicomte du Roure, and, upon his early death, the Vicomte de Thésan; the fifth, the Marquis de Grammont. For Madlle. de Maintenon, as soon as she was sixteen, her parents and friends selected a husband, and she acquiesced without remonstrance in their choice. She was married in 1783, before she had reached her seventeenth year, to the Marquis Joachim de Montagu, the only son of the Vicomte de Beaune. The match was sufficiently splendid, the prospect of future happiness cloudless; but when, after seven weeks' festivity, her husband, entrusting her to the care of his father and his aunt, went to rejoin his regiment, it is not wonderful that she felt as if she had been launched upon the ocean of the world with but little preparation for the voyage.

She soon won the hearts of her new relatives, and wanted

* P. 7.

no other happiness when, in the summer of 1784, a daughter was born to her. "Such an intoxication of delight," writes her biographer, "is rarely to be seen. The child's slightest cry in the night was the occasion of mortal disquietude, and at the same time of a thrill of joy. She set up its cradle as a barrier between the world and herself."* But the child only lived a few months, and her grief was as despairing as her joy had been ecstatic, though each perhaps as little understood by those she lived with as the other. Her father-in-law, resenting her tears, forced her into society; but the constraint which she put upon herself was greater than she could bear; her health utterly broke down, and she was obliged to leave Paris. Two daughters came in due time to supply the place of the lost one, but at their father's wish they were nursed, in true French fashion, by country foster-mothers; and Madame de Montagu could not plead their care as a reason for not entering upon the round of society which was so distasteful to her. Again and again her strength failed, till at last a heavy blow came in the death of her younger child, Clotilde, in February 1790.

"It was the second which she had lost. After having watched its agony the livelong night and received its last sigh, she was praying, all drowned in tears, by the side of the corpse, when a messenger came to tell her that Madame de Grammont, who was then residing in the Hôtel de Noailles, had just brought into the world her first-born child. This news, which at any other time would have been a pure cause of joy, now served only to augment her grief. Nevertheless, after fresh sobs and fresh prayers, she rose, dressed herself, asked her astonished husband if any one could see in her eyes that she had been crying, and announced her intention of going to her sister. He tried in vain to dissuade her; she was afraid lest the young and happy mother should be disquieted by her absence—that she should ask and be told the reason; and this she was resolved to prevent by the courageous act which she was about to perform. So she went to the Hôtel de Noailles, saw the new-born child in its cradle, kissed her sister, and spoke to her with a composed countenance. She flattered herself that she should be able to return as she came; but her strength betrayed her, she could not even reach her carriage, and fell fainting to the ground in the room next her sister's."†

* P. 28.

† Pp. 54, 55.

The first clouds of the French Revolution had now begun to gather, and the times were such as promised to try severely even such heroic strength as this. Madame de Montagu's position was peculiar and difficult. Her own family belonged to the better part of the old French aristocracy, who had comparatively little to reproach themselves with, and who welcomed, though with a welcome mingled with apprehension, the prospect of reform in state and society. Two of her brothers-in-law, M. de Noailles and M. de la Fayette, had fought through the American War, whence they had returned full of high hopes and generous schemes for the future of France. They carried with them, to a certain extent, MM. de Grammont and de Montagu—the latter, perhaps, less completely than the former. Even M. d'Ayen, her father, presided over the Provincial Assembly of Limousin; M. de Beaune, her father-in-law, over that of Auvergne,—which, with the other Provincial Assemblies of France, were convoked in 1787 and 1788. But as the Revolution gradually developed itself, a family divergence was soon manifested. M. de Beaune was, after all, a true aristocrat at heart; Madame d'Ayen, whose influence over Madame de Montagu was very great, looked forward with great distrust to the future; while M. de la Fayette and M. de Noailles suffered themselves to be carried forward with the wave of popular feeling, which they fancied (idly as the event proved) that they were doing much to direct. At last the difference came to an actual conflict of policy. M. de Beaune was eager to emigrate—his daughter-in-law not unwilling to accompany him; while her husband, although not buoyed up by democratic hopes, thought expatriation the worst possible method of serving the king and the cause of moderate reform. The struggle ended by the solitary departure of the old man for Germany; while M. and Madame de Montagu left Paris for their ancestral chateau of Plauzat in Auvergne. But during the few months that they remained here, by turns the objects of popular adulation and insult, according to the varying passion of the hour, events at Paris made terrible progress; and the king's flight and arrest at Varennes seemed to announce the complete triumph of the Revolution. Nevertheless, M. de Montagu would have remained to tempt his fate in France, had it not been for the reproaches of his father, who, in his exile at Coblenz,

seemed to feel as a personal affront and disgrace his son's independent action. Still the latter would not join the mass of emigrants upon the Rhine, but bent his thoughts to England. There, in December 1791, he arrived, with wife and daughter, establishing himself upon Richmond Hill, where he found a colony of exiles already gathered. How little Madame de Montagu understood the real significance of the step which she had taken, may be gathered from the fact, that it was only in compliance with a suggestion of her sister's, offered at the very moment of departure, that she took her diamonds with her. "What do I want with diamonds?" she said; "I shall not wear them; I am not going to a fête." Before very long she was glad to sell them to buy bread.

At Richmond her troubles soon recommenced. Her husband returned to France, in order if possible to save his property from sequestration. In his absence, her last surviving daughter was attacked by the disease which had proved fatal to the other two, and died after a few days' illness. Upon this news, M. de Montagu at once hastened from Paris to rejoin his wife, though without having succeeded in the object of his journey. But his course was now altered. He equipped himself for the camp, and joined his father and the Royalist army at Coblenz, establishing his now childless wife in a poor lodging at Aix-la-Chapelle. Here she remained for some months, living upon twenty sous a day, torn by sorrow, as one piece of black intelligence after another came from France, and distracted by anxiety for her husband's fate, especially when, after the battle of Jemappes, he was missing for five days. That decisive victory had an unexpected influence upon her fortunes. Dumourier marched upon Aix; and the emigrants, who had just settled themselves in that city for the winter, were forced to flee. After a most toilsome and perilous journey they reached Helvoetsluys, whence they embarked once more for England. Here they took up their abode in a cottage near Margate, a modest asylum which was not long suffered to shelter them; for when, upon the death of Louis XVI., England declared war upon the French Republic, all emigrants were ordered to quit the coast, and M. de Montagu, with his wife and father, once more betook himself to Richmond.

It is difficult to follow all the journeys of this hunted

household, which, in addition to its other troubles, began now to feel the heavy hand of poverty. With all the will to economize, Madame de Montagu had never learned lessons of frugality, and now found it a hard virtue. Mistakes are serious things when there is nothing to replace the spoiled dinner or the ill-made garment; and M. de Beaune grew querulous in adversity. Presently, considerations of expense urged them to quit England for a cheaper country, and they resolved to pitch their tent at Brussels. Here, notwithstanding the most rigid economy, their small resources gradually melted away. No news came from France of either Madame d'Ayen, who had remained there in pious attendance upon her mother-in-law, or of her daughter. A little one, Alexandre, who had been born to Madame de Montagu at Richmond, died, and left her once more childless. Just at this moment came an invitation which offered her a position of comparative security and comfort, if only she could make up her mind to leave her husband and his father. An aunt, Madame de Tessé, no *devote* like herself, but a kindly old Voltairean, who took the world easily, and knew how to do a generous act with a certain careless grace, asked her to come and stay with her at Lowenberg, in Switzerland. There, in the exercise of a foresight rare among the Royalist emigrants, she had bought an estate, and lived in rude plenty among her own flocks and herds. Pressed by necessity, Madame de Montagu at last accepted the invitation; M. de Montagu meanwhile taking refuge with his maternal grandfather, the Marquis de la Salle, at Constance, and thus leaving what poor resources still remained to them free for the support of M. de Beaune. Money was almost equally scarce with aunt and niece; for to defray the expenses of the latter's journey from Brussels to Lowenberg, Madame de Tessé sent, not a banker's order, but a valuable ancestral snuff-box, which, confided to the friendly hands of Lord Douglas of Glenbervie, was sold in England for one hundred pounds.

The friendly relation between aunt and niece thus begun lasted for a life-time :

" Madame de Tessé was in all respects a very remarkable person ; little, with piercing eyes ; a pretty face, spoiled at twenty years of age by the small-pox ; a delicate mouth, somewhat drawn aside by a nervous tic which caused her to make faces when she talked ;

but, in spite of this, possessing an imposing air, graceful and dignified in all her movements, and above all of an infinite wit. She was one of the ladies of the ancient régime, possessed by the philosophical ideas of the age, and intoxicated with the seductive reforms which in her eyes were to lead on the regeneration and the happiness of France. In a word, she was a liberal and a philosopher. In philosophy, Voltaire, with whom she had been much connected, was her master; in politics, M. de la Fayette, her nephew, was her hero.*

But for all this, Madame de Tessé was a kind-hearted old heathen. Caring nothing for priests herself, she maintained, out of the proceeds of her kitchen garden, three poor exiled curés, who had found a refuge near her at Gormund; and pretended neither to see nor to hear when, upon a visit to them, Madame de Montagu boldly knelt down and made her confession. At a later period, when, driven from Switzerland, she settled herself in Holstein, she burdened her establishment with another clerical exile, whom she made her chaplain. "A chaplain was quite a new luxury to her, and the place was a sinecure for the Abbé de Luchet; but, said Madame de Tessé with a smile, 'My niece is there to find him something to do.'" She ruled her family and her estate with a maternal despotism.

"As for M. de Tessé, grandee of Spain of the first class, knight of various orders, lieutenant-general of the royal armies, first equerry to her late Majesty the Queen, and, last of all, deputy for Maine in the States General,—he superintended the improvements on the estates, went a journey now and then when needful, but in the salon filled an unimportant place and made little noise."†

It was at Lowenberg that Madame de Montagu's crowning sorrow came upon her. For some time she had received no news of her mother and her eldest sister Madame de Noailles, whom she knew to be in Paris, and therefore in terrible peril. A letter now and then from France, or a newspaper describing the horrors of the Reign of Terror, bade her fear the worst; and yet almost any news was better than the consuming apprehension which put no bounds to its imagination of evil. Her separation from her husband, the loss of all her children, drove back her thoughts upon her mother

* P. 133.

† P. 137.

and sister, till she could bear the suspense no longer, and set out towards the Canton de Vaud, where she hoped to find her father. On the way thither she met him, so strangely changed that she recognized him only by his voice. The news was soon told ; there could be no worse. On the 22nd of July, 1794, forty-six persons of every age and station had been guillotined at the Barrière du Trône. Among them were the aged Maréchale de Noailles, too old and dazed even to understand her fate ; her daughter-in-law, the Duchesse d'Ayen ; and her granddaughter, the Vicomtesse de Noailles—three generations at a stroke !

This was the moment at which the government of Friburg chose to require Madame de Tessé to send away "the foreign lady whom she had hidden at Lowenberg." With admirable delicacy and kindness, the disciple of Voltaire not only kept the demand from her niece's knowledge, but deferred to her religious feelings so far as to cause a mass for the victims of the Terror to be celebrated in a neighbouring church, situated in a Catholic canton. To the magistrates of Friburg, she replied, "that the foreign lady whom they ordered her to send away was her own niece, in mourning for near relatives newly murdered, and without any other place of refuge than that which she had offered her, not thinking that there was any law to forbid such an action, or that, if there were, men could be found to execute it." They gave way at last, though not till Madame de Montagu had acknowledged their authority by a voluntary retirement to Constance ; but Madame de Tessé found it expedient for other reasons to quit the grudging hospitality of Switzerland. Lowenberg was secretly sold, the price paid into a Hamburg bank, and, after some delay and a temporary residence at Erfurt, a home was found for the little colony at Witmold, near Ploen, in Holstein. Hither presently came M. de Montagu ; then, after their long imprisonment together at Olmütz, M. de la Fayette and his heroic wife. Here at last a son, who grew to man's estate, was born to Madame de Montagu. But the chief occupation of these years was an extensive scheme for the relief of the French emigrants throughout Europe. Madame de Montagu had herself felt the pinching hand of indigence, and now, safe in an asylum where all her wants were supplied, could not hear without poignant distress of the sufferings of thousands, many of

whom were as nobly born and gently nurtured as herself. Assisted by the Count von Stolberg and his wife (of whose somewhat notorious conversion to Catholicism she was the chief cause), she raised a subscription in almost every country in Europe, which was carefully and generously applied to its destined purpose. Her own labour and trouble were perhaps the largest subscription of all. She was necessarily brought into connection with emigrants all over the continent; and in her rural solitude in Holstein she found a situation for one, sold drawings and embroidery for another—in short, received every possible kind of application and rendered every possible service.

“She had so many wants to satisfy, and relatively so little to give, that she became parsimonious, and incurred the railery of Witmold. ‘My niece,’ gaily said Madame de Tessé, ‘always gives to people just sixpence less than would make them happy.’ But then this sixpence, which she economized, was daily bread for some one else. . . . She was for ever rummaging in her boxes and wardrobes to find something which she could either sell or give. She ended by giving away the suit of black cloth which had been her mourning for her mother, and which she had piously kept as a kind of relic. Another time she gave away her prayer-book. She gave away everything; her work, her time, her sleep. . . . Misfortune did not spare Madame de Montagu’s own family. But them she helped only by the produce of her own work, not because she blushed to see them share the offerings of public charity, for there are circumstances in which it is as dignified to receive as in others to give, but only because, as a trustee of public liberality, she did not think she had a right to give to her own friends, or at least was scrupulous in exercising it. One day, when she was busy with a piece of embroidery, Madame de Tessé, noticing that she was weary, and guessing by the effort that she was making that some one was waiting for the price of the work, gave her a gold box of the weight of six louis. ‘Only,’ she said, ‘do not squander the money; I beg that you will give it all to the emigrant whom you love best.’ Madame de Montagu said at once that she would give it to her father-in-law. It was for him that she was working. This was in January, 1798, and the old chief of the coalition of Auvergne, then living at Wandsbeck, could not afford wood to warm his stove.”*

But it is time to draw this brief sketch, which after all is rather a catalogue of facts than a delineation of character,

* Pp. 247—249.

to a conclusion. Madame de Montagu returned to Paris with her husband in the beginning of the year 1800. After so varied and so bitter an experience of life, she was still only in her thirty-fourth year. She lived to see the Empire, the Restoration, the days of July ; surviving her aunt, her sisters, her husband, even her son. The sorrow of domestic bereavement pursued her to the last, and she was almost alone when she died in 1839. Much that the biographer has to tell of her patience, her sweetness, her superabounding charities in these latter days, need not be repeated here.

In the piety of Madlle. de Guérin and of Madame de Montagu, developed by so different an experience of life, there is a common quality. It has its root, as all piety must have, in a very vivid and constant apprehension of spiritual realities—God and Christ, present duty and future retribution. But it is characteristic of Roman Catholic piety not only to have a deep conviction that these things are, but a very clear conception of what they are ; the whole world of supersensual existences, which a more philosophic faith recognizes as surrounded with a halo of mystery, is seen in the sharpest outline ; and intelligence of the heavenly powers, as definite and well authenticated as any that the *Moniteur* or the *Times* supplies from earthly courts and camps, may always be procured by application in the proper quarter. Strange to say, the form of religion most fruitful in what are called, in theological phrase, mysteries, is of all others, in the true sense of the word, least mysterious ; takes least practical account, that is, of the necessary incapacity of the finite human intellect to apprehend and express the infinite. We frankly admit that facts parallel to this may be observed on the Protestant side of the great division of the Church ; there are theologians, standing at the point of furthest repulsion from Catholic feeling and doctrine, who claim to possess a wonderfully minute knowledge of the ways of God, and profess, in regard to this nation or that church, to be able to interpret even His intentions. But whoever has fairly looked these things in the face, trying to make out for himself what words really mean, and how far human ideas correspond to divine realities, must have a solemn sense of the inadequacy of thought and language alike to represent supernatural facts ; and cannot but feel that a certain indefiniteness of assertion, except in regard to the simplest ele-

ments of belief, is only a reverent acknowledgment of necessary ignorance. The very contrary of this is characteristic of Catholic faith. It not only sees, but sees confidently, clearly, minutely. Being not only dispensed from the labour of examination, but forbidden to examine, it receives the simplest moral precept and the most stupendous theological mystery with equal simplicity. The word of the Church is its single evidence, and that word may as well be taken for what is difficult as for what is easy. Most Protestants find a difficulty in understanding this state of mind, because, being accustomed to subject the articles of their creed to some personal examination, or to flatter themselves that they do so, they feel that the cardinal doctrines of Roman Catholicism would be to them a perpetual stone of stumbling.

"Men of this world," says Dr. Newman, "do not know the ideas and motives which religion sets before the spiritually illuminated mind. They do not enter into them or realize them even when they are told them; and they do not believe that another can be influenced by them, even when he professes them. . . . They are so narrow-minded, such is the meanness of their intellectual make, that when a Catholic professes this or that doctrine of the Church,—sin, judgment, heaven and hell, the blood of Christ, the merits of Saints, the power of Mary, or the Real Presence,—and says that these are the objects which inspire his thoughts and direct his actions through the day, they cannot take in that he is in earnest; for they think, forsooth, that these points are and ought to be his very difficulties, and that he gets over them by putting force on his reason, and thinks of them as little as he can, not dreaming that they exert an influence on his life."*

When once a doubt as to what the Protestant critic might call the difficult doctrines of Catholicism springs up in the mind, the peculiar force of Catholic faith is gone; to question, to examine, to hesitate, is, in its moral effect, the same thing as to deny.

It must not be forgotten, in the next place, how wonderfully elaborate is the system of dogmatic and practical assertion, to the reception of which the Catholic is required to bring this clear and quiet faith. We have not to do here with the elementary truths, the simple principles, which a

* Discourses addressed to Mixed Congregations, p. 5.

devout Theism thinks enough for guidance in life and support in death ; or with that comprehensive reference to the Bible, as containing all things necessary to salvation, the result of which in most cases is, that each individual Protestant takes what suits him and leaves the rest. Here is a Church, founded by Christ himself, and which, as his perpetual representative upon earth, makes indefeasible claims upon the obedience of all the faithful ; supporting those claims by unceasing miracle ; preserving the form of doctrine drawn from the Scriptures by ecumenical councils, yet asserting and exercising the right of adding new articles to the creed ; enthroning Mary by the side of God and encouraging the devotion of her children to a vast hierarchy of saints ; opening and shutting the gates of purgatory by her powerful word ; interfering, by countless astute agents, in political and social life, to carry out a subtle and persistent policy ; preserving an access to every conscience in the practice of auricular confession, and wielding a vast personal influence in the consequent gift or refusal of the sacraments. Everything in theology, in politics, in morals, is clearly and sharply defined ; no question can be addressed to the Church but receives a prompt answer, and the answer is not only decisive, but infallible. Whatever range is allowed to mind or heart or conscience, lies within well-known limits ; and the crook is always ready to pull back the straying sheep to safe pasturage.

Once more : the sacerdotal and the sacramental theories of the Catholic Church—theories essentially inseparable—work in the same direction. The heavenly blessings which on earth are entrusted to the distribution of the Church, she dispenses only through the channel of the sacraments ; and a sacrament can be administered by none but a regularly ordained priest. Much might here be said of the effect of this theory in extending and consolidating the power of the Church, by the way in which it forces the mass of believers into contact with and dependence upon the sacerdotal class ; but our present object is with its effect upon the religious feelings of the votary. And this can only be of a mechanical kind. For it practically declares that the possibility of all strengthening and enlightening communion between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God is bound up with the performance of a rite, and that apart from the

rite such communion can be nothing better than a wretched delusion. Nor to those who have happily risen to the conception that the noblest privilege and the finest possibility of humanity is to speak face to face with God, without the intervention of any mediator, can anything more painfully stunt and maim the religious nature than to place between the soul and its Divine Original an order of men and a round of ceremonies. To such the ceremonies must be a mockery; and were it not for the evidence of facts, they would find it hard to believe that the men are not impostors too. How strange is it to note the feverish eagerness of Eugénie de Guérin—knowing, as she does, the sweetness of her brother's character and the innocence of his life—that he should receive final absolution from the village curé at Le Cayla, and die with the viaticum upon his lips! She tells us little of her brother Erembert, and what little she reveals throws absolutely no light upon his character. But he seems to have lived without any open profession of religion; and when, after Maurice's death, some unrecorded circumstances induce him to confess and to communicate, her jubilant cry is no less than "Encore un frère sauvé"—Once more a brother saved! Until he again committed mortal sin he was safe; and what more could be desired? So in the exciting account of the execution of Madame d'Ayen and her daughter, a great point is made of the fact that an aged priest, Père Carrichon, disguised himself in secular attire, and, mingling with the crowd that yelled around the tumbrel, gave them a silent absolution at the very foot of the scaffold. If the narrative we have quoted be trustworthy, no nobler women ever passed to their account by the gate of an undeserved death. Yet although from their childhood they had lived with God, and served Him with conscientious devotion—though they must have sought and found Him not once, but many times, in the long agony of their imprisonment—they still prepared to enter His presence in another world with a more assured faith, because this poor human blessing had been uttered over their death! How strange to think that it still needed to approach God with a charm, and that such a charm would suffice to propitiate Him!

The general effect of the principles and theories which we have endeavoured to characterize, is to make the Catho-

lic religious life more of a *discipline* than an *aspiration*—something which is to be imposed from without, rather than developed from within. And this effect is indefinitely increased by the practice of confession. The word confession calls up in the Protestant mind ideas of weak women moulded by designing priests; of sacerdotal use of family secrets and sacerdotal interference with family relations; of everything, in short, against which the British husband and father sets his face like a flint. But this, though a true, is only a partial view of the subject. The theory of confession is that of the dependence for guidance of a weak upon a stronger soul; and its essence is expressed far more fully by the French word “*directeur*,” than by our “*confessor*.” For the confessor’s work, when completely accomplished, is much more than to hear the confession of his penitent and to give the required absolution; he has opportunities of advice such as no other friend can have, as well as the power of shrouding his counsel in secrecy, and enforcing it by the sanctions of religion. He is the authorized interpreter of this elaborate and definite system of doctrine and morals to the individual soul, the nearest and most effectual restraint upon any spontaneousness of belief and action. Such dependence upon a director would be to most souls which have breathed the fresher breezes of Protestant piety an intolerable slavery, and yet is not so necessarily. We shall never penetrate to the secret of another form of faith, if we persist in believing that it is to those who hold it what it would be to ourselves. Influences which, as we think, cannot fail to destroy the religious life, may practically end in giving it another method and line of development. Listen to the terms in which Eugénie de Guérin speaks of a confessor—terms with which it is difficult for a Protestant mind to sympathize:

“I did not deceive myself in thinking that I should return with a more tranquil mind. M. Bories is not leaving us. How happy I am, and how I have thanked God for this favour! For it is a great favour to me to keep this good father, this good guide, this chosen of God for my soul, to use the expression of St. Francis de Sales.... In the world no one knows what a confessor is—this friend of the soul, its closest confidant, its physician, its master, its light; this man who binds and looses, who gives us peace, who opens heaven to us, to whom we speak upon

our knees, calling him, like God, our father, because in fact faith makes him truly God and father. Woe to me if, when I am at his feet, I see anything but Jesus Christ listening to Magdalen, and forgiving her because she loved much. Confession is an expansion of repentance into love. A very sweet thing, a great happiness for the Christian soul, is confession—a great good, the greater in proportion as we enjoy it, and as the heart of the priest into which we shed our tears resembles the Divine Heart which has so greatly loved us. This is what attaches me to M. Bories.”*

The Catholic life is, then, a watched and guarded obedience to *precepts*, rather than a spontaneous adoption and carrying out of *principles*. It is characterized by an entire absence of the indefinite; its hopes, its methods, its objects, all are certain, fixed, rigid. There is nothing fluctuating or varying in the moral ideal which is set before the aspirant; the object of his desire will not reveal itself as nobler and more difficult as he advances towards it; the elements which make up saintliness can all be weighed and measured. For holiness is a somewhat, prescribed and defined by the Church from the very first, and therefore cannot change its aspect; not a vision of the soul which, as its sight grows clearer and its powers of attainment more practised, shews itself in ever more perfect symmetry and develops a subtler beauty. Then, in the accomplishment of the task set before him, the disciple is so far from being left to walk alone, that he is surrounded with helps and safeguards; there is a mechanical regularity in the supply of heavenly grace through the well-known sacramental media; and the conditions of social life are so contrived as to prevent the possibility of religious self-dependence. It is difficult to contrast with this any ideal of life which can be distinctively called Protestant, for Catholic habits of thought still linger more or less in various forms of Protestantism. There is a likeness between Catholic definiteness of dogmatic conception and the logical accuracy and coherence of the Calvinistic theology; while the Anglicanism which would imprison all communion with God within the limits of the Prayer-book, and confine daily meditation to the daily lesson and collect, does all it can to abdicate the self-determination which is the essence, and ought to be the glory, of Protestant piety. But there is, nevertheless, a radical difference between the religious life of

* Journal, p. 108.

Catholic and Protestant. To the Catholic, the Church presents God, Christ, Mary, the Saints, duty, the life to come, as clearly defined realities, in regard to which there can be no lawful doubt or hesitation; offers him a sharply-cut faith, sets before him a distinct task, prescribes the exact method in which he is to perform it. But the Protestant is in the last resort thrown back upon his own thought of these divine existences,—a thought which, though it rests with himself to make it as clear and coherent as may be, must always share the obscurity of the Infinite; while in his practical relation to them, he is left to the keenness of his own conscience, the strength of his own will, the flight of his own heavenward desire. He sees his ideal ennobled as he approaches it, and he is conscious sometimes of moving towards it upon a wavering line. He cannot sharply sunder in his thought this life and the next, the world and the church, and regulate his life according to its relations to the church and the future only; he desires to bring his aspiration and action into harmony with the whole providence of God, and of that knows no interpreter more divine and more authoritative than his own soul. He has a harder task to accomplish than his Catholic brother, and fewer artificial aids in its performance; but if his ideal be freer and larger, what wonder that he less perfectly realizes it?

Following the track of the same idea, we shall penetrate the secret of the Catholic conception of the relation of the believer to the outside world. For there is no point at which the boundaries of the church and the world can be seen to melt into each other—no debateable ground between the two kingdoms; whoever is not Christ's is Satan's, and all friendly intercourse must be treason. So that what, in Protestant phrase, we call bigotry, narrowness, exclusiveness, tacitly admitting it to be a perversion of the religious spirit, is of the very idea of Catholicism, which is tolerant only to gain its own ends, and where it cannot help it. We see something of this anxious separation of the elect from the ungodly in the Evangelical society of England, where cards are the devil's book, and the theatre his chosen temple, and a dance the repetition of Herodias' sin, and the reading of a novel a trifling with the soul's immortal interests. But Evangelical men are not less eager than others in business

and politics, and can be called unworldly only if we are willing to adopt their own definition of unworldliness. For the consistent application of their own theory of life, they must look to Rome. She too condemns theatres and novels, though somehow she does not look quite so askance at cards and dancing ; but then she goes further too, and to the seeker after absolute perfection would prohibit just as stoutly the hustings and the exchange. In the cloister alone is the true Christian ideal to be found ; in the renunciation of every worldly occupation and interest, in the abandonment of even domestic affection, in the undivided attention to personal salvation. And if perchance the monastic life be unattainable, then life in the world must as much as possible be conformed to it ; the thoughts forbidden to rove in fields of profane literature ; the affections set as little as may be upon earthly objects ; and all the energy which duty does not imperatively claim, devoted to meditation and prayer. It is wonderful within what narrow limits a noble soul may live and yet be noble :

Bees that soar for bloom
High as the highest peak of Furness fells,
Will murmur by the hour in foxglove bells ;

and yet it is pitiful to see a woman like Eugénie de Guérin, with a mind capable of receiving the most varied culture and of separating for itself wholesome food from poison, turning over the leaves of Victor Hugo's *Nôtre Dame*, yet not venturing to read a word, and doing her best to make life in Paris a repetition of the dull seclusion of *Le Cayla*.

But if the Church and the world be thus absolutely separate and opposed, Roman Catholicism recognizes no intervening power as possible. There is but one true church, and all the rest mean and poor pretenders. Every other form of faith than that divinely sanctioned and upheld is heresy, and heresy is a thing to be cast out as utterly abominable. The ignorance of Protestant belief and life displayed in purely Catholic literature, is much more remarkable than the contempt expressed at the same time so freely ; while recent events in England and Ireland seem to shew that even Anglican converts fail to impart to their new superiors any adequate knowledge of the religious home which they have quitted. In short, if such a word can be

rightly used of the greatest and most ancient of the churches, Roman Catholicism is essentially sectarian ; for it exhibits itself as equivalent to Christianity, even to religion, and is unwilling to recognize the existence of either beyond its own border. And this is the very definition of sectarianism. On the other hand, as Mr. Arnold has well pointed out in the article to which we have already referred, it is saved from much of the practical meanness and narrowness of sectarian feeling by the very splendour of its ancestry and the amplitude of its fold. To confine one's sympathies and aspirations within the bounds of any single church, is treason against the width and multiplicity of Christianity ; but it is one thing to starve the soul on the associations of some petty Protestant sect which has inscribed no single name on the long roll of Christian saints, and another to feed on the spiritual food provided by a church which can trace its history to the days of the apostles, which from that time to this has helped to mould for good or ill the civilization of Europe, which has watered every savage island of the East with the blood of her servants, and which counts among her children Augustine and Fenelon, Æ Kempis and Pascal. There is a grandeur about sectarianism such as this which blinds us at first to its true nature ; and the unity of exclusion, so nearly successful, shews almost as winning as the unity of comprehension, which is all that true Protestantism can offer in its stead.

But, indeed, life here under any modification fares but ill at the hands of Catholic teachers compared with the life to come. Once more, this arises in great part from the definiteness of religious conception on which we have dwelt so much. The celestial is as clearly mapped out as the terrestrial globe ; the tremendous alternative of eternal life or eternal death hangs upon a relation to Church authorities on earth which admits of neither doubt nor mistake ; the soul's parting sigh is the beginning of a new existence, of which the priest who has watched by the bedside can accurately predict the nature. Compare eternity with time, the changeful earthly lot of every human soul with the ineffable bliss or ineffable woe which awaits it hereafter, and reflect that the character of the life to come is conceived as inseparably connected with present relations to the Church and its ministers, and the contempt of the true Catholic devo-

tion for life is at once explained. It is a season of perpetual risk which it were well to have happily passed ; a scene of haunting temptations, seeking to draw aside the soul from its true path of pilgrimage ; a time of deceitful joys, unfitting the soul for the eternal enjoyment of God ; an anxious phase of existence over which Satan and all evil angels exercise permitted sway—anything, in short, rather than God's best gift, to be used, and enjoyed, and prized for His sake. Whom the gods love die young, is, if a heathen, also a Catholic thought ; none so happy as those who pass to their account with their baptismal innocence still unsullied. So, in one sense, death is of more account than life in Catholic thought ; and the important question to be asked, not what manner of man such an one was, but did he die with the sacraments of the Church ? The true Catholic saint has always dug his own grave, in imagination at least, if not, like some austere monks, with actual spade and mattock ; and a skull is part of the furniture of every cell. *Mors janua vitæ* is the motto of all piety ; and life on this side the gate only a fleeting, an unsubstantial, an unsatisfying vision of the night.

This frame of mind is so far from withdrawing the will from active and self-sacrificing dutifulness, that it acts in some respects as a powerful incentive to it. Those to whom this life, as compared with another of which they feel assured, is worth least, will most cheerfully take it in their hands, and risk its loss when need is. The soldier of Islam, believing that an immediate access to Paradise is the reward of him who falls in battle against the infidel, rather seeks than shuns the sword's point of his foe. There is hardly a hospital in Europe which has not its tale to tell of the heroism of Catholic women, who, because they believe in things unseen with an energy of faith which is all but sight, freely yield up their lives in the service of suffering humanity. Something military seems to mingle in the spirit and often to prescribe the methods of Catholic dutifulness ; a priest who deserts a post of personal danger, or who murmurs because his superior bids him take it, is rarely to be found, though other phases of unpriestly misconduct exist in the same proportion as in other folds. So the Catholic layman who wishes to engage in benevolent work finds his hesitations anticipated, his doubts answered or set aside, his task pre-

scribed, his place reserved. Not only is he spared the uncertainties of individual action, but he is set where his special aptitudes will produce the best effect, and where he is sure of supervision and support. He has not to pause to weigh and estimate his plans, to ask himself what proportion of good and attendant ill they are likely to produce, to examine whether they are in accordance with the fixed laws and general tendencies of society,—the Church approves or dictates them, and it is enough. He has not to find or to appraise, but only to do his duty.

It is not necessary to dwell on the persistent energy, the unquestioning devotion which is the natural result of thus accepting from the lips of a visible authority the principles and the methods of dutifulness. The Church which thus assumes the heavy responsibility of saying to this man, "Go," and to that man, "Come," may seem to need a knowledge and a wisdom all but superhuman; but for those of whom only obedience is asked, it leaves action happily untrammelled by any difficulties of choice, any uncertainties of expediency. Who does not know how great a gain the loss of self-determination might sometimes be! What force and precision might not be added to our activity if we were relieved from the necessity of either choosing our task or discovering the best way of performing it! It is in many ways easier to march up to a battery at the word of command than to exercise the responsibility of giving that word, and so of risking brave lives against a possible advantage; death itself may not be so terrible to face as disgraceful failure. But with all the advantage of this military devotion and discipline, the Roman Catholic philanthropist labours at a disadvantage. Working in the world, he still works against it; he has no sympathy with its aspirations and does not share its aims; he is never carried along with the full tide of its life, but is constantly employed in the unhopeful task of stemming it. His object is to make society something quite other than it could naturally become; to benumb its own vitality, and then to galvanize it into the semblance of the life of the Church. If he educates, it is not in the interests of knowledge or truth in the abstract, but in those of Roman Catholicism. He gives alms, because alms are the ecclesiastical form of charity; but he does not stay his hand to reflect upon economic laws and the possible

results of his generosity. His politics are dictated to him from Rome, and his idea of good government is a paternal despotism sweetened by saints'-days. He will give, work, suffer, die for the people; but it must be in his own way, and to the furtherance of his own system, which he thinks that only the innate perversity and wickedness of mankind would prompt them to resist. And, after all, he is surprised to find that the people are willing to follow, even through fire and blood, some leader who has done and borne for them far less than himself, but who believes with them that their aims are not all wicked, their aspirations not wholly fruitless, and that the kingdom of God is to be established not by slaying, but by transfiguring the world.

Roman Catholicism is fruitful of saints; but if what we have said be true, there is something artificial in saintliness. Protestantism aims, though for the most part unconsciously, to rear men, and there must always be something incomplete in manliness. The ideal of the first is lower and less complex, but more perfectly realized; the characteristic cry of the latter is, "not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect." Saints are marvels of control, restraint, repression; men, of life, development, growth; those, the triumphs of an ecclesiastical system; these, the natural product of divine forces. There is a more exact symmetry there, but here a more exuberant life; obedience moulds the one, self-determination forms the other. But both are due in the last resort to the energy of that "one and the self-same Spirit who divideth to every man severally as He will."

CHARLES BEARD.

IV.—FEMALE EDUCATION IN THE MIDDLE CLASS.

"If you neglect the education of men, they must in a certain degree educate themselves by their commerce with the world. . . . But if you neglect to educate the mind of a woman by the speculative difficulties which occur in literature, it can never be educated at all; if you do not effectually rouse it by Education, it must remain for ever languid.

Uneducated men may escape intellectual degradation ; uneducated women cannot." So writes, more than half a century ago, the witty Canon of St. Paul's, whose sentences go ever direct to the mark of good sense and right feeling, whether flashed forth with brightest wit and richest humour, or spoken as here "with all plainness of speech." The acknowledgment may be made that the Education of Woman has improved since his day. Such a half-century of awakening, of movement, of ever-accelerating progress towards—the end only will shew whether—Eden or Chaos, could hardly pass over without affecting in some degree for good the position of half the race. The position of woman depends upon education. If the position of women, then the real condition of man. Education of women in the middle class, once what it should be, would bring after it the education of *all* women. First, because the tendency of all modern social and political changes is to augment the number of those who have "neither poverty nor riches," so that everywhere the proportion of those who, while having means, must yet work, increases as compared with those who have means and no work (upper class), and those who have work and no means (lower class). Next, because the education fitted for the middle class is that which is best for all classes. Then, too, education of women would compel the education of men. Let the direct teaching (*bildung*) of girls be once wisely arranged, so that the time devoted to physical, intellectual and moral education should not as at present be wasted, and direct results, on the standard of female intelligence, would be produced far greater than will or can come, *directly*, from any however wise scheme for teaching boys. At present, as every one has experienced, girls possess often a larger share of accurate and useful knowledge than their brothers. Teach them reasonably, as they now begin to be taught, and changes will come over society. When girls shall commonly master Euclid and Latin, with a modern language added, and really understand English, there will be hopes that the peculiarly aristocratic quality of insolent ignorance may be made ashamed even in its last refuge—young Conservative M.P.'s. Of so much there is hope and more. Girls are more docile than boys, through feminine softness, if you please. Girls receive more easily what is put, with tolerable skill, before them ; being more impres-

sible by the stamp of a perverse education, so also of a just one, if they come under it. There is every hope and every omen, at present, for the great and rapid improvement of the education of girls in the middle class.

This present writer entertains no objection to feminine artists, writers, or landed proprietors; sees no reason why ladies should not qualify themselves, if they can, to cure all ills that flesh is heir to; or, feeling an inward wish to lay down the law, fit themselves to understand it; has no doubt that female preachers would often be less dull than male ones. He feels no interest in the question of what they *might* become if they *could* be educated out of women into something else, because he does not believe such result to be within the limits even of that transcendent improbability which Germans call "*die philosophische möglichkeit*." Perhaps he ought to blush in confessing that he holds to the very ancient opinion that, Wifehood and Motherhood being the true destiny of woman, all true education must have for purpose, mediate or immediate, to form perfect Wives and Mothers. Perhaps he ought to blush yet more deeply in uttering the truism—as self-evident and as consistently violated as the golden rule—that the just development, the improved instruction, of all the faculties and powers of women, cannot have other result than to produce wise and good wives and mothers. Now wives may be admitted to be in some degree matters of taste; about mothers there can be no two opinions. Young men seeking life's partner may be content with girls whose toilette and valse-step are unexceptionable; and may prefer as nymphs, those whose natural aversion to thought and study, secures a swain against becoming conscious of his own greater ignorance. Each bridegroom, sincerely loving, believes that his bride will be a phoenix, and rise, in due time, out of the dry ashes of "society" to the queenly dignity of wife and mother. But that wisdom is needed to bring up children aright, no one doubts; that a wisdom is needed which has to be aided by knowledge, however truly founded on gifts bestowed by nature on good mothers, and denied to the best of fathers. All that has been said about the power of woman in educating boys—not sons only, but pupils—is true, and nothing near the whole truth. The enthusiastic Educator, rightly viewing his office as, at this day, more certainly useful to

mankind than any other, were he but "sufficient for these things," says, "Give *me* your children, and I will return you intelligent men, good citizens, with a fair sprinkling of thinkers and poets." At what age will you have them? He will not venture to ask for them, all to himself, earlier than at nine or ten. Too late! Are they children of wise mothers, half your work is done to your hand; have a care lest you spoil it! Come they to you from careless, selfish, shallow-hearted women, they are spoiled before you touch them! The twig has got its bent.

Men must desire that women be well taught, that there may be more wise and good men in the world. The true education of woman is enlightened self-interest to man. Are they not our first teachers? The impressions they make on us are never rubbed out by all the friction and polish in the world. The direction they give to our tastes is never wholly turned aside. The principles they instil are never quite lost. There is something beyond French elegance in an epitaph of the Parisian cemetery, Mont Parnasse: "*Répose en paix, ma mère; ton fils t'obéira toujours.*" More than that! They are our teachers always; ungrateful pupils, head-strong scholars that we are! The cunning ones among them know it, and lead us by the nose. The simple-minded and true-hearted lead us by the heart; occasionally, it may be admitted, wrong, but generally, if we follow wisely, aright. Most striking, most instructive, as well as noble in expression, is Mr. Ruskin's assertion, in the second Manchester Lecture, "Lilies," of the queenly character of woman, illustrated from the female characters of Shakspeare and of Walter Scott. Let it be admitted that he exaggerates, if any one is comforted by this discount which contented Mediocrity always largely strikes from utterances too high, or too far-reaching, for mediocrity's eye-glass. Supposing, therefore, that the lords of the creation had the decision in their hands, whether and how far woman should be educated, admitted to equal rights in the temple of learning and the republic of letters, every motive leads us, as an act of enlightened self-interest, to remove every barrier and give every franchise. Whatever woman gains hereafter, she will give, as she hath ever given, with but too ungrudging hand, to man. The decision is, however, far less in our hands than in hers. Emancipation,

in its last and truest sense, is ever the soul's own work. To man one might say, "Try a noble confidence in those from whom you derive the noblest and purest part of yourself; give every chance; withhold no aid; try free-trade in education, as you now try it in food and in poison; let woman become in fact, all that God hath made her in idea." To woman: "Do whatever you can; learn to do *something* well; improve yourself in all directions; take up a few stitches in a flimsy education; put your lymphatic intellect to the gymnastic of some tough reading; concentrate wandering thoughts with problems; if your self-culture is really at its A B C, read a volume of the 'Pursuit of Knowledge under Difficulties.'"

A few hints may be attempted about the improvements needed and practicable. With respect to physical education, suppose we took a leaf out of our grandmothers' book! No better appliances of physical education can be imagined than those which Home affords; if a refined home, so much the better; with home-farm and dairy included, better still! Calisthenics are very good, but a little artificial: gymnastics and drilling may be good, but rather inclined to the Amazonian: dancing is excellent, when taught for development and practised for pleasure, not display. Reason has nothing to say against riding, or swimming, or skating, except that two of them depend on season, and one on wealth. But all of these end in themselves. If they are means, they are means to folly. That there is virtue in bodily Work, is a discovery gradually making its way into our minds: *work*, by which something is accomplished; whose end, therefore, to the worker, is beyond himself. As feminine gymnastic, the churning of butter or the kneading of bread is better than the use of any dumb-bells or chest-expanders. Every process of cookery is chemical, and when taught by those who know how to teach, would not end with learning how to pamper appetite. A chemist of European reputation, Dr. Angus Smith, lectured one day upon House-cleaning, and shewed with how many laws of nature, in the keeping or breaking of which are issues of life and death, so vulgar a matter is bound up. Household-management, in every link, demands exactness and punctuality. These qualities men are born with, about as often as women. Men learn them of necessity: why deny to girls

the same natural instruction by work and duty? No one understands a game till he has gone through the moves, or is competent to judge of an art which he has not practised. Now it is the trade or calling of all but the minority of women to preside over a household; so, to learn thoroughly whatever belongs to the housewifely character, seems *every* woman's special apprenticeship. It begins naturally before the school age, when a little maiden loves nothing so much as "to help mamma." House-work should be carried on during the school age, because it affords bodily work and practical discipline, and at the same time education, of a kind fitted to relieve intellectual studies. No time would be lost. Even in the matter of "getting on" at book-learning, there is proof enough for those who seek it, that a portion of the day given to hand-work—as gardening or carpentry for boys, house-work for girls—does not put the head-work back, but steadies and helps it on. When the school age is past, taste and talent may turn from household work to pursuits that require more effort of mind. Yet no lady artist or student will ever regret having learned and practised housewifery; while emergencies of travelling or sudden illness may raise to unspeakable value every item of domestic faculty. Among the signs of the future which can be seen without prophetic eye is this, that domestic service will be less and less followed as a trade, and therefore domestic help become increasingly difficult to buy. Refined and educated women, therefore, will actually come to perform the house-work, of necessity. But before the necessity comes, it would not be difficult for sensible women to see that among the many duties that fall upon her who orders her household aright, there is none more mechanical, less interesting, than those which fall to the lot of their brothers and husbands. It will be, however, a beautiful necessity that shall shew to the modern women of England that there is no discrepancy, but a perfect harmony, between womanly refinement and the knowledge and practice of all those branches of art and science that go to the right management of a home. Never, this present writer ventures to predict, will the force and fervour of masculine gratitude be known till *then*. *Then!* when, at the magic touches of cultivated women, lamps shall burn, coffee grow potable, potatoes cease to be stony-hearted, pastry present itself in a digestible form, and

the cookery of England become, in the opinion of her sons, as superior to that of France, as English politics and religion have ever been !

With respect to Intellectual education, two ideas seemingly opposed, really complementary, demand equal attention. One : "natural gifts ought to be cultivated to their greatest possible perfection." The other : "faculties, appearing to be weak, should receive special care, in order that a harmony of powers may if possible be produced." Any one can see which is easy and which difficult. Any one could divine which has been best, however imperfectly, followed. Powers naturally weak need a helping hand ; the faculty that is by nature strong will take care of itself. Any talent—as for music or drawing—that early shews itself, ought, in the interest of the whole mind, rather to be kept under than encouraged, receiving just enough attention to secure manual execution. In practice, such talent is made almost the sole object of culture. Thus powers are left uncultivated which are not only in themselves superior in value to the one talent itself, but necessary to success in the art to which everything is sacrificed. A true artist belongs to the class of those who possess and originate great Thoughts, and is distinguished among them by special talent for the one form in which he presents his thoughts. If the inner spring of Thought and Imagination have not been nourished, have been carefully neglected or sealed up, we may expect the talent to produce, it may be, a surprising fiddler or a copyist of dead nature to the point of illusion, but never a great composer or painter. So much for the talents that, rightly managed, might grow up to Art, but which usually stagnate into accomplishment.

Still greater evils in female education intellectual, are two : Plethora of words, and Atrophy of thought. Verbal memory being usually very active in Girls, is just that faculty which needs watching and keeping down. The faculty of Reasoning is given in various degrees, *perhaps* to all human beings ; not more to Males, as such, than to Females. To attain its due force and proper action, it needs nourishment and training alike in both. The stronger sex shews ordinarily more strength here, simply by virtue of the education of fact and necessity, which in the case of men, supplements the defects of instruction. In girls, who

have been taught, verbal Memory continually starts up, and says with perfect good faith—"I am Thought, I am Reflection, I am Opinion." The elements of a science are taught. What have the learners learnt? Not ideas, *words*; not laws of thought, *names*. The teacher believes herself to teach History: the text-book is thoroughly mastered: her scholars have added extensively to their vocabulary of proper names: they know a distinguished group of historical personages to speak of; have they gained any notion of the principles of action of these characters, any idea of the reason of events, any apprehension of the chain of times? You take a class through a course of Geography; what remains to them? Words! How prevent a modern female education, with its varied curriculum, from passing wholly away? There is only one way: to require *thought* in whatever the pupil learns; to permit nothing to be swallowed whole; to see that every word represents something in the learner's mind, either an object or an idea; to esteem nothing learned until it has been brought again out of the pupil's mind, with the colour of that mind upon it. To be sure, for this purpose, teachers are needed who are somewhat more than animated bookstands, with additional action for frowning, putting down marks, and turning the leaves of text-books. With true Teachers, the matter of teaching may be left very free. Even the demands of parents, however irrational, might be complied with, so long as the rules of common sense were followed, viz. to make every subject exercise thought, and to attempt only so much as can be truly worked out. If the study of ancient languages be so transcendently useful, as the educators of boys say, for mental discipline, let girls be taught Latin and Greek. With rational teaching, they would give as good a percentage of real scholars as boys at present give. We may be permitted to express our belief, with Dr. Morell, "that the best English classics, if only studied with the same closeness, and illustrated with the same copiousness, as is usually done with the Greek and Latin classics, would afford almost an equal amount of material for mental culture." Mathematics, as the introduction to so many sciences, and as containing also admirable mental gymnastic, would form a portion of all true education: with the modest warning, that the power of Mathematics, when irrationally taught,

to deaden and stupify the mind, surpasses that of any known subject of instruction. Geometry may be so learned, that the ancient method of acquiring the rare art of spelling correctly,—by committing to memory columns from the Dictionary,—should seem by comparison lively. This is so when the array of Definitions and Axioms, Enunciations and Demonstrations, are learnt by rote. It may be taught, so that the discovery of every fresh relation of angle and line shall produce a lively delight.

Real education begins where the school age ends, or is ending. Then, individual taste shews itself, and each mind takes, as each mind should, its own line. If the school age preparation has been what it should be, now will be seen a springing forwards to “fresh fields and pastures new;” an aim to complete what is felt to be defective in culture of intellect; an impulse to perfect any perceived talent. For young women, it is truly said, few means of the higher education are yet provided. Here strikes in the melodious raillery of our Poet Laureate in his poem upon the Princess, who, having excluded men, sets up an university for women—with “violet-hooded doctors”—“the long hall glittering like a bed of flowers”—and so forth, all correct in order and arrangement. Not the studies, however, but the unnatural division, Tennyson ridicules. He allows to women all studies, all means of knowledge. And who are they that would deny? Man has no right to decree what is unwomanly to know, or unwomanly to do. Woman’s conscience, her instinct of beauty, her tried and cultivated taste, will tell her best what is good. Men have no prerogative to shut up any corner of knowledge for themselves. From this does not follow, that it is desirable to assimilate the higher training of Maidens to that of Youths; to provide for young ladies, examinations, with mysterious varieties of “Greats,” “Mods,” and “Smalls,” where girls could obtain honours, or be occasionally “plucked” or “ploughed,” and proceed at last “Spinsters of Arts,” or “Mistresses of Science,” having gained on the way to that high culmination, medals for Greek lyrics, containing the regulation *quantum* of dialect; or for Latin hexameters, in which the most unfriendly inspection would not detect a false quantity; or for an English poem, whose poetry none can perceive! Such distinctions are not *above* the powers or merits of woman; they

are *beneath* her. That they produce cramming, one-sided and selfish study, is known; along with much weakened sight, and no small amount of permanently injured brain: that they ever fostered genuine learning is not known. Knowledge, every noble study, is essentially not means, but end. Every science is a portal, every language a window, to look upon or to move towards infinity. Woman, far less than man, needs the stimulus of a selfish aim. For the present, those who after their school life mean to study, must be resolute. Means are not yet all that might be wished. They will have little help from fashion. Still, books are abundant. The direct aid of a maturer mind, though to the end of the age of study, i.e. to the end of life, a learner's most precious help, is now less needful than at an earlier age. The accomplishments which take up so undue a share of the school age, can be deepened into studies. The practice of difficult concertos, which every hearer, unconsciously echoing the great Dr. Johnson, wishes had been impossible, may lead to the theory of music; and the drawings *from* Nature which not in the most venial degree infringed the first commandment, may be advanced to a study of perspective, and thoroughness in some branch of art. If a lady prefer to study Greek or Hebrew, why should she not? What Christian can deny the worth of learning the original languages of Holy Scripture? That the task would have great difficulties, is not the question. To overcome these is the arena of self-education. Some may think Modern languages more suitable than Ancient ones, and Literature more advantageous than exact Science. All this will find itself. The point is, that all who have leisure should cultivate their minds, on the principle that all women as well as men are born to work. What shall women do who are not forced to do anything? "Do good," says the curate. But knowledge, study, these are the philosopher's stone that transmutes the common metals of leisure and kind intentions into the fine gold of practical good. "Visiting the poor," means knowledge, or does harm (cf. Mrs. Pardiggle). Tending the sick needs apprenticeship; ask Miss Nightingale. As preparation for every kind of usefulness, *cultivate the mind*. That needs nothing but leisure and books, except sense of duty, resolution to work, courage to resist the sensation novel, fortitude to sacrifice an occa-

sional soireé. Mental wealth is the true ballast of character : the vessel sails deeper and steadier. Personal interest—that quality of women which wise men do not repine at, by which actual persons and their concerns are so much more interesting to women than either thoughts or facts—finds here its counterpoise. Here is the correction for “feminine” defects. Inaccuracy of thought, brought by reading face to face with accurate thought, will see itself as it is. Carelessness of statement, comparing itself in literature with the exact style which says what it means, unrepeating, unexaggerating, endeavours to correct itself. Laws are still unjust towards women, custom is still irrational, and will continue so, until women and men both have become reasonable. Women still live under a tyranny, are still enslaved ; but far more to their own uncleared ideas, to fashions of their own doing and suffering, than to any conventions made or upheld by men. Freedom is in their own hands. They gain it by freeing their minds ; by caring for Ideas ; by resting in eternal Truths ; by living to the calm verities of abstract Science—to the infinite, ever-new harmonies of natural History—to the never-wearying, ever-awakening truths of Humanity in history, in language, in literature. To be independent, they must learn to live alone : to feel not lonely, but in presence of all that is highest and purest, whenever duty permits them to enjoy the absence of society. They need not be unsocial, yet are not compelled to be gregarious. Viewing dress and fashion as by some degrees lower than the highest aims of the soul, they need not cloud their natural love of beauty in form and colour, into sanctimonious hue or funereal shape. Looking upon society as a recreation, not a profession, they yet have no call to put the world into wilful eclipse by cutting off their social talents and elegant gifts. What the world needs is cultivated women—abroad and at home.

The threefold division culminates in Moral education. That there is need to improve the moral education of women is easy to see. If many women, almost whole classes, are brought up to wrong moral views, instructed in false principles supposed to be religious, trained to not defective only, but perverted sense of duty, then improvement in moral, in religious, in soul education is not necessary only, is possible. And yet—*teach* morality, *teach* religion, *teach* sense

of duty!—the phrases contain their own contradiction. This present writer was once requested by a mother to teach her child to love and obey its parents. He respectfully declined the flattering request, to supply by art an original defect of nature. Nor has the recipe been given for spiritual food that could nourish into ideal life souls that have been ever clogged by the pomps and vanities, or held down by the heavy wasting cares, of this world. No spiritual medicine is yet known for bringing to life a Love that never breathed, or removing a congenital paralysis of Conscience. Therefore best efforts of moral education may fail against unfortunate nature, and, with the best, do little more than not pervert, or dwarf, more favoured original parts. Those who believe that on the whole human nature is good, will see how immense will be the gain when moral teaching ceases to do harm. If it be true, as has been throughout this paper assumed, that direct conscious teaching and training, in all its kinds, is more efficacious with woman than with man, the gain will be inestimable when the tone of “society” respecting woman shall be counteracted by teachers directly pointing out to girls, yet more by their always implying, the true purpose and earnest meaning of Life. The moral training of girls should start from the Old Covenant’s simple but never antiquated notion, Woman the Helpmeet of Man, and thus provide beforehand an antidote for the poison of modern “society,” whose tone respecting woman flows manifestly from notions partly Chivalresque or Mediæval, partly Heathenish, partly pseudo-Moslem.

The falsest, most heartless of all Philosophies, is that which preaches despair. “You can do nothing—therefore make no endeavour.” The true and humble consequence of knowing we can do but little is, “Do what you can with all your might.” Therefore, they who teach girls, being themselves possessed, not dismally but cheerfully, of the earnestness of life, will bring to their pupils that conviction. They will shew the simple facts of life and of the world: will teach that they who are above (?) toil for bread, will certainly have influence that cannot be easily overstated on the happiness of others. This, whether they pass from youth into homes of their own, or whether they be chosen, or choose, to serve God in the often more arduous, often

nobler lot, of single life. They will point out that woman does not do her own nature justice, unless by faithful self-culture: has therefore, without that, no claim on happiness, or peace, or even contentment. They will make clear that opportunities absolutely boundless of serving mankind lie around women of the educated class, if only they know how to do any one thing right: a knowledge obviously not involved in any yet prevalent idea of education. Tending and guiding, as they are the special gifts of woman, remain ever the major part of her duty. But for those who improve their talents there remains a side, a department, of every human work. In every kind of labour at present exclusively done by male activity—every science, every art, in philanthropy, in education—there is a share which woman can do, can do better than man, is alone fitted to do. This, which might have been easily foreseen, is now by best workers universally acknowledged, and, like Dogberry's indictment, "will come to be believed shortly." This insight into the true position of woman, her power and duty, should accompany all efforts to call forth religious feeling—to teach principles of morals—to train girls "to that station of life to which it hath pleased God to call them." Letting them see their worth and the need of them in helping forward that "good old cause" of the improvement of mankind, would cure many girls, from the beginning, of the pietism and quietism which turns so many excellent mothers, wives, and sisters, into religious "silly women." To shew them that every one is wanted to be useful in the world; that not one can be spared from helping at the good work; so that all are bound to fit themselves for *some* useful work which has to be done to-day with punctuality and exactness, while it helps to bring on the Millennium, would save them—or some of them—from the churchisms or sectisms which, whatever they set out with, always end in sanctifying vanity or consecrating ill feeling. Dorcas of Joppa may not be justly esteemed the highest specimen of Christian womanhood; but one who has learned to coin her leisure into "coats and garments for the poor," will be less likely to hold present fashions of church millinery for the best modern rendering of "Holiness to the Lord." Those who have learned to prefer the silent converse of the wise to the personal gossip of the foolish, are less likely to partake with pleasure

of Recordite scandal about somebody's errors in doctrine, and his uncertain prospects for the world to come.

Implied therein is, that teachers must not, in fact, set up Fashion as "the principal thing," while in words exalting Wisdom. Accomplishments, most of which are made merely mechanical, and so taught as no more to enrich or discipline the soul than does the commonest housewifely work, must not be permitted to override cultivation and exercise of Mind. That strong love of approbation, which comes to be thought so feminine, chiefly because in girls it is apt to be overfed, must not be unduly nourished, but rather counterpoised by instilling, or calling forth, sense of Duty for its own sake ; love of Right and Truth as being for ever, not means, but ends.

Why should the moral education of women be improved? "Because (in the words of Aimé Martin) their education is ours : to give them noble, high thoughts, is to kill at one single blow our little passions and our small ambitions. We shall be worth the more as they become better, and they cannot make us better without becoming happier themselves." Woman's moral education should be amended, because woman ought to lead man upwards. There is yet in Englishmen some of the old Teutonic reverence for women—whatever society may seem to say—as for beings who stand nearer to the Divinity than we do. All poetic dreams about women are *true* : true of the past : true in the future, if not actual in the present. True, because every right-hearted man has *known* one or two, who come up to everything that imagination has seen, or poesy painted, of womanly excellence. Man, who has learned truly to *value* woman, must of necessity *over-value* her. Her virtues are mysteries to him. Her snatches of insight seem to him like inspirations from a higher source. She sees at once the Truth, and closes at once with the Right, though sacrifices crowd the way ; cuts through the meshes of self-deception down at once to the root of the matter, touching with a flash, what man is weary hours trying to reach. Made by nature, a statue of ethereal grace and heavenly metal, woman wants only the pedestal ; and that she must get, and chiefly give herself, by education. This pedestal is mainly composed of the cultivated sense, the fixed principle of *duty* ; whereto the cultivation of all intellectual powers,

the learning of accuracy in expression from distinctness of thought, serve as most precious aids. These qualities may seem to men who have them, vastly inferior to those gifts which men have not. To women who have them not, they should seem more valuable than what they have.

Women must become priestesses to watch the inner sanctuary of all unselfish ideas. To hold high before men's eyes the standard of perfect justice to all living things, of perfect love for our brethren, is her service. Women have here an advantage over Men. They need not, as men must, get their feet ever clogged in the mud of base Reality, or believe, what we cannot help sometimes, that Might makes Right. While learning facts, and seeing things as they are, woman need never lose the higher sight that distinguishes between the Eternal which alone truly is, and the Transient "which is as a shadow and continueth not." Therefore she can always out of the depth of her own assurance, deeper and not so hardly tried as man's, give him the help of her faith. Need is that the statue of ethereal beauty, which is true Woman, should make for itself a pedestal of solid Common Sense and firm Moral Principles, so that man may worship not the human image, but the spiritual truth of which it becomes to every heart, once in life, the living symbol.

"The woman's cause is man's : they rise or sink
Together, dwarf'd or godlike, bond or free : . . .
. . . in the long years liker must they grow ;
The man be more of woman, she of man ; . . .
Till at the last she set herself to man,
Like perfect music unto noble words ;
And so these twain, upon the skirts of Time,
Sit side by side, full-summ'd in all their powers,
Dispensing Harvest, sowing the To-be . . ."

W. H. HERFORD.

V.—THE LATER ISAIAH.

IN resuming this subject, we have before us the consideration of the latter half of the book of Isaiah, and, in particular, the question of the authenticity of the last twenty-seven chapters. We have already* noticed some of the principal reasons which may be given for discriminating between certain chapters in the earlier part of the book as the authentic† production of this distinguished prophet, and certain other chapters as not entitled to be so regarded; and which indeed, we have seen, are in all probability not from his pen. The reasons on which this conclusion has been founded are of a plain and obvious kind. They seem to lie very much on the surface of the subject, even to the ordinary reader of the English Bible. It is on this account that we have confined our remarks so entirely to them; and we now propose to apply the same kind of discussion to the remainder of the book; thus completing, in as few words as possible, the task which we have undertaken.

It will be convenient, in the first place, to notice the grounds on which the latter part of Isaiah may be reasonably presented to us as an authentic part of Isaiah's writings. There are two or three very obvious reasons which might induce the reader to rest in this conclusion, if they were not countervailed by others of greatly superior importance.

(1.) There is, then, it may be alleged, an unbroken stream of Jewish and Christian tradition, from the earliest times down to within a comparatively recent period, in favour of the authenticity of these chapters. In the third century before Christ, the author of the Wisdom of Sirach‡ clearly refers to them as a part of the book of Isaiah. His words

* Theol. Rev., 1866, pp. 1—21.

† We use the terms *authentic*, *authenticity*, in what is at least a very convenient distinctive sense, and one not unauthorized by their etymology, as denoting that the work to which they are applied is really from the hand of the author whose name it bears. *Genuineness* appears to express the uncorrupted state in which a writing has been preserved; while to denote its trustworthy character, we have such words as *credible*, *historical*, *true*, and the like. *Authentic* is also used to denote these latter qualities, because what comes to us on the known word of a trustworthy person partakes of the credit we ascribe to his name. But this use of the word is perhaps hardly to be encouraged.

‡ Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 22—24.

are these: "He [Isaiah] saw by an excellent spirit what should come to pass at the last, and he comforted them that mourned in Sion." So it has been ever since, among both Jews and Christians, until about the middle of the last century. But so, it may be replied, it has also been with other portions of the Old Testament,—as, for example, with the Psalms, which, with comparatively few exceptions, had always been received as compositions of David, whereas it is now well ascertained that the larger number in the collection cannot have been written by him. The same may be said of the Pentateuch also, so universally regarded in former times as the work of Moses; and so with some other parts of the older Scriptures. Little weight can be attached to this argument from unbroken tradition, in the face of valid opposing evidence. We do not know on what ground the writer of Ecclesiasticus may have received the chapters as authentic; and, in the absence of this knowledge, the mere fact that he did so can only indicate that, without any special inquiry, he fell into the current belief of his age. We suppose, at all events, the writer of Ecclesiasticus was not infallible; and until it can be shewn that he, or any other person of the older Jewish or Christian times, who may identify the chapters in question with the book of Isaiah, was possessed of satisfactory historical and critical evidence as to their origin, their statements can have no value in opposition to positive marks of time and place in the chapters themselves.

(2.) It has been alleged, again, that some of the Old Testament books refer to these chapters in such a way as to shew that they were in existence when those books were written. Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zephaniah, are cited as witnesses to this effect; but any one who will take the trouble to look at the passages appealed to,* will see that the argument amounts to little or nothing. These prophets do not mention the *name* of Isaiah, nor intimate that the supposed quotations or allusions are taken from any written composition whatever. The slight similarity of expression which is apparent may have been, in part, accidental; or it may have happened to two writers both to employ a phrase in common

* Jer. x. 1—16, v. 25, xxv. 31, l. 51; Ezek. xxiii. 40—41; Zeph. ii. 15, iii. 10. When it is said that Zeph. ii. 15 is an allusion to Isaiah xlvii. 8, what is to shew us that the converse of this is not rather the truth?

use around them, without either of them having seen what the other had written. That one or other of these suppositions applies to the alleged cases of quotation from these chapters by the prophets just named, will hardly admit of a doubt.

On the other hand, there is the unquestionable fact that Jeremiah, though grievously persecuted and threatened with death, because he announced the Babylonian captivity as then near at hand, yet, when he spoke in his own defence before the princes and people, so far as we can judge from the account of the transaction,* did not remind his persecutors that the greatest of his predecessors, even the prophet Isaiah, had foretold the same captivity. This omission would be hardly explicable on the supposition put forward, that Jeremiah was familiar with this part of Isaiah as a well-known work of his time, and that he even made use of its words in the places alleged.

It has even been urged, in proof of the existence of the twenty-seven chapters before the return from captivity, that the decree of Cyrus, noticed in Ezra i. 2—4, was "founded" upon them; that, as recorded by Ezra, it even adopts some of their words. This statement cannot, we apprehend, to an unprejudiced inquirer, prove anything more or less than the extreme credulity of one who would attach importance to it. It is, however, repeated in substance by the Subdean of Wells in the article in the Dictionary of the Bible to which we have formerly referred,† and this fact may be supposed to give the statement in question a certain degree of extraneous or accidental authority. It nevertheless causes us unfeigned surprise, to find that any such position can be supposed to be established, or made more probable, by such evidence. Granting that the decree of Cyrus, as mentioned by Ezra and at the close of the Chronicles, acknowledges Jehovah as having conferred upon Cyrus his empire, and charged him with the duty of rebuilding His temple at Jerusalem, there is in neither passage any verbal reference to any written prophecy of Isaiah. In both places, the writers expressly speak of "the word of the Lord by the mouth of *Jeremiah*." The writings of Jeremiah, *not* those of Isaiah, are by the sacred historians said to have been ful-

* Jer. xxv. 8—11, xxvi. 8—24.

† Theol. Rev., Vol. III. p. 18.

filled by Cyrus—though it seems to suit modern theologians of a particular school to invert this fact. Moreover, may we not very properly regard the two statements as made under a certain Jewish influence, and coloured with a certain Jewish colouring? The exact words of the decree are not given—do not profess to be given; and it only remains for us to conclude that the sacred writers, referring all that had occurred to the Supreme will, felt themselves at liberty to speak of Cyrus and his decree in the terms employed,—as the special means of carrying out the intentions of Jehovah formerly declared by His prophet.

Very similar observations must be made in regard to another alleged ground for supposing that Cyrus acted in deference to the Divine will, as revealed by Isaiah in these chapters. Josephus has a passage to this effect,* alleging that the prophecies of Isaiah induced the Persian conqueror to release the Jews. There is no reason to believe that this statement of Josephus had any other foundation than the words of the Chronicles and Ezra. If so, it cannot have any greater weight in establishing the authenticity of the disputed chapters. If such were *not* the source of the statement, we can only suppose Josephus to have written in accordance with some old and prevailing tradition of his day. And to this, what authority shall we now attach? In fact, however, being thus in ignorance, but knowing, nevertheless, that Josephus is not always the most accurate or reliable of historians, it is not difficult to conclude that he was mistaken in saying that it was the prophecies of Isaiah which induced Cyrus to release the Jews. Why may it not have been the prophecies of *Jeremiah*, seeing that these are expressly named by Ezra as fulfilled by the decree, and that in some parts of them there is a distinct announcement† of the overthrow of Babylon and the deliverance of Israel? This is probably the best account that can be given of the matter; and hence all that Hengstenberg has urged, or the Sub-dean of Wells after him, about the improbability of Cyrus being deceived by pseudo-prophecies, “forged” under Isaiah’s name, is simply beside the mark.

(3.) There remain, however, certain New Testament pas-

* Joseph. Antiq. xi. 1, 2.

† Jer. xxv. 12, 13, xlv. 27, 28, l. 33—36.

sages, in which reference is made to Isaiah as the author of what is found only within the limits of the last twenty-seven chapters. Matthew and Luke, for example, and the Apostle Paul, mention the name of Isaiah as the prophet from whom they cite words which are found in the doubtful portion of the book called after him.* On the strength of this, it must certainly be allowed that Isaiah was popularly regarded and spoken of in early Christian times as the author of the entire book of Isaiah. But still one or two important questions remain. Was this opinion of early Christian times well founded?—or is it, at all events, so binding upon our times as to prohibit us from critical investigation, and make us close our eyes to all evidence that runs counter to it? If, as we are told, the New Testament writers were “inspired,” we may nevertheless reply, that whatever their inspiration in regard to moral or religious subjects, they do not profess to be inspired on this particular point of the authenticity of Isaiah, any more than in regard to the origin of the Pentateuch, which they doubtless also received, without inquiry, as the composition of Moses. As Jews, they were evidently contented to repeat the current ideas of their countrymen on these subjects. It was quite enough for their immediate purpose so to do. But this is far from enough for those who are under the influence of modern ideas of critical and historical truth and exactness. We are bound by obvious considerations to employ the best means which Providence has placed within our reach, for ascertaining the truth on this and all other questions; nor need we be deterred from so doing by vague and unauthorized statements of modern theologians, claiming in behalf of the New Testament writers what they do not claim for themselves, viz., that they were “inspired.”

We really feel, however, that some apology is due to our readers for employing so many words on this point, or for arguing seriously in defence of the right and necessity of using the critical knowledge of our times to ascertain the true state of the case in regard to the authenticity of these chapters. We hope we have not trespassed unreasonably in thus doing; but so long as writers so respectable by

* E.g., Matt. iii. 3 and parallel places; Luke iv. 17; Acts viii. 8, 28; Rom. x. 16—20.

position and attainments are found to put forth the statements we have been noticing, it seems hardly possible, if we treat of the subject at all, to avoid pointing out the weakness and inconclusiveness of their arguments.

(4.) To some of our readers, perhaps, the following may appear to form a stronger reason for ascribing the disputed chapters to Isaiah. According to the historical statement of the thirty-ninth chapter, that prophet foresaw the Babylonian captivity, and spoke of it to Hezekiah. The same statement appears also in the second Book of Kings, ch. xx. 17, 18. We do not know the age from which either of these historical sections comes down to us. Neither of them is derived from the other, as may be shewn, almost to demonstration, by a comparison of their words. They are both derived from some older document of which we know nothing certain, the exact form and words of which are not before us. But judging from what we have, we can see that Isaiah's anticipation of the Babylonian captivity was of a general kind. It was simply the kind of foreknowledge which would doubtless be within the reach of any man of Hezekiah's time, of ordinary political sagacity. But whether it were so or not, certainly the anticipation, as recorded in ch. xxxix., goes a very little way towards shewing that Isaiah was the author of the twenty-seven chapters following,—occupied as these are, not with any announcement of coming captivity, as in xxxix., but solely with the announcement of deliverance. In Isaiah's time, Babylonia was probably an Assyrian province of great and increasing importance, the ruler or king of which was desirous to fortify himself by an alliance with Hezekiah. If, therefore, Isaiah were led to foresee, and to express his fear, that the little kingdom of Judah would at some future time become subject to the superior power which was now seeking its friendship, he is nowhere said to have also predicted deliverance from such subjection. We are left, then, very much where we were, and have only to acknowledge that ch. xxxix., standing where it does, forms a very suitable introduction to what follows it. This was no doubt the main reason for putting it where it is ; while yet its contents throw no light upon the question of authorship which now more especially concerns us.

It is certainly a strange and perplexing circumstance that,

if Isaiah were not the author of these chapters, so noble a writer as their writer unquestionably was, so great a prophet, and one who has exercised so vast an influence upon Jews and Christians of all succeeding times, should not have been handed down to us by name. Who *did* write these remarkable chapters, if Isaiah did not? It is something like asking, who erected Stonehenge; or wrought the Apollo Belvidere; or composed the book of Job, or that of Enoch; or wrote the list of the dukes of Edom in the thirty-sixth chapter of Genesis. We cannot answer these questions, while yet the works are undoubtedly there, in spite of our ignorance, and there seems to be an end of the matter. Strange as it may be that the name should not have been preserved, yet various conceivable causes may have led to its concealment and ultimate loss. We will not attempt to enlarge upon these, but content ourselves with simply protesting that our want of knowledge as to the author of these chapters is no reason for attributing their composition to Isaiah—if, at least, there be found in the chapters themselves sufficient grounds for concluding that he cannot have had anything to do with their origin.

To the investigation of this point, therefore, we may now proceed.

We have formerly stated, what is no doubt very familiar to most of our readers, that, for a long period past, the most eminent German critics have assigned these chapters to an unknown author who lived towards the close of the captivity, and was probably himself one of the captives. It is quite remarkable how unanimously this conclusion has, in substance, been accepted by the Biblical scholars of Germany of the highest reputation. There is hardly an exception to be made to this statement; unless any one should consider Hengstenberg and one or two others as entitled to be so regarded. Recent English writers who have taken the same side of the question have done no more than repeat the statements of the Germans,—as, indeed, the latter have left little more to be done, so complete and exhaustive has been their discussion of the subject. It is objected, however, to the writers who have thus favoured the negative view, that they have, to some extent, treated the subject on philosophical and speculative grounds; and also that they differ from each other in regard to the reasons which they allege

against this and other sections of the book of Isaiah, as well as even, in some instances, in regard to the authorship of particular sections. These objections are not without foundation. It would be wonderful if it were otherwise. Independent writers may be expected sometimes to differ from each other in matters of detail, while yet they may be perfectly agreed on the great broad features of the question on which they write. As to the philosophical and speculative grounds on which negative arguments may be and have been founded, it is enough to observe that, even without them, the simply critical and historical grounds for impugning the chapters now before us are amply sufficient; and that, as to any one's speculative difficulties in relation to miracles, or the possibility of prophecy (in the sense of prediction) uttered so long beforehand, such objections, whatever their validity, may be left entirely out of our present discussion.

It is convenient, however, to assign a name to the unknown author of these chapters, and we cannot do better than designate him, in the usual way, as the *Later Isaiah*. This name is of course borrowed from that of the earlier, but hardly greater, prophet. Whoever he may have been, if we had any reason to suppose that his name were really *Isaiah*, this fact might account for the circumstance that, of two prophets bearing the same name, the later of the two was absorbed, as it were, and lost sight of as a separate person, in the earlier fame and importance of the elder. The political circumstances of the captivity, followed by the return home of the captives and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, would be likely to conduce to this result. So, at any rate, it is; we can only speak of an *Isaiah* and a *Later Isaiah*; recognizing in this distinction the important fact that an interval of not less than a hundred and fifty years separated the one prophet from the other.

Some of the more important, and at the same time more obvious, reasons for this conclusion we will proceed, in the next place, to set forth.

The prophet evidently takes his stand, from the beginning to the end of the prophecy, in the midst of the captivity. He never once, even by any chance expression or indirect allusion, causes us to suspect that he is looking forward from the time of *Hezekiah* into a dark and remote future,

but speaks of the circumstances of the captivity and of the people whom they affected, in a way which plainly indicates that they were present and familiar to him at the moment of writing; that he was referring to men, to objects, and to incidents, of which and of whom he had in himself had personal experience. Jehovah is introduced as determined to deliver His people: they have been disobedient and sinful, but they have received their punishment, and the time of release is at hand. The power of Jehovah shall accomplish this; for He is infinitely exalted above man, and above all the idols and princes of the nations. They that wait upon Him shall renew their strength, and be strong in His might;—for

“It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth,
And the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers;
That stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain,
And spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in:
That bringeth princes to nothing,
That maketh the judges of the earth as vanity.”

(Is. xl. 22, 23.)*

While, then, the time of the captivity is present to the author, the destruction of Judah is something past and gone, just as the deliverance is something about very speedily to come. The anger of Jehovah has long since been manifested against His people; Judah is a wilderness, and its cities, with Jerusalem and the temple, are lying in ruins. The following passages, chosen from among many others that might be brought forward, will be seen amply to justify these statements:

“Jehovah was well pleased, for his righteousness' sake,
To give them [Israel] a great and glorious law:
And yet this is a people robbed and spoiled,
Ensnared in holes, all of them, and hidden in prison houses;
They are for a prey, and none delivereth,
A spoil, and none saith, Restore.
Who among you will give ear to this?
Will attend and hearken for the time to come?
Who hath given Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers?
Hath not Jehovah, he against whom we have sinned?

* In the quotations from Isaiah in this and the former article, we have used the “Revised Translation” of the Old Testament by Wellbeloved, Smith and Porter. London, 1859—1862.

In whose ways they would not walk,
 Neither would they hearken unto his law :
 Therefore he hath poured upon them the fury of his anger,
 And the strength of battle ;
 And it hath set them on fire round about,
 Yet they knew not ;
 And it consumed them, yet they laid it not to heart."
 (xlii. 21—25.)

"But now, O Jehovah, thou art our father ;
 We are the clay and thou the potter,
 And we are all the work of thy hand.
 Be not wroth to the uttermost, O Jehovah,
 Neither remember iniquity for ever :
 Behold, see, we beseech thee, thy people are we all.
 Thy holy cities are a wilderness,
 Zion is a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation ;
 Our holy and our beautiful house,
 Where our fathers praised thee,
 Is burned up with fire,
 And all our pleasant things are laid waste.
 Wilt thou restrain thyself at these things, O Jehovah ?
 Wilt thou keep silence, and afflict us to the uttermost ?"
 (lxiv. 8—12.)

Can any one conceive of the prophet Isaiah writing in this strain, in the comparatively prosperous days of Hezekiah, a hundred and fifty years before the event? Or, if he did so, how is it to be accounted for that other prophets of the Assyrian period—as Amos, Hosea, Nahum—never make any allusion to the captivity, or to deliverance from it?

But the later Isaiah, again, announces also the means by which the deliverance is to be effected ; and, by mentioning even the name of the deliverer, he shews us that he lived at the same time, and was himself a distant spectator of the great occurrences which resulted in the foundation of the Persian empire :

"Who hath raised up a deliverer from the east,
 And called him to his foot ?
 Who hath given up nations before him
 And subdued kings,
 So that his sword hath made them as the dust,
 As driven stubble, his bow ?
 He hath pursued them, and passed safely,
 By a path which his feet had not gone :

Who hath wrought it and done it ?
 He who called forth the generations from the beginning,
 I Jehovah, who am the first, and with the last ;
 I am he." (xli. 2—4.)

The same theme is resumed thus, with the addition of the conqueror's name :

"Thus saith Jehovah to his anointed,
 Even to Cyrus,
 Whom I hold by his right hand,
 To subdue nations before him ;
 And for whom I will loosen the loins of kings,
 To open before him the two-leaved doors ;
 And that the gates may not be shut :
 I will go before thee, and make the uneven places straight ;
 I will break in pieces the doors of brass,
 And cut in sunder the bars of iron :
 And I will give thee the treasures concealed in darkness,
 And hidden riches of secret places,
 That thou mayest know that I am Jehovah,
 Who calleth thee by thy name, the God of Israel."
 (xlv. 1—3.)

These great changes, brought about by means of Cyrus, have been long ago announced, and by this foreknowledge, Jehovah has manifested His divine power and His superiority to the idol deities :

"Who hath declared this from the beginning,
 That we might know ?
 And before time, that we might say, It is right ?
 Yea, none hath declared,
 Yea, none hath proclaimed it,
 Yea, none hath heard your words.
 I first said to Zion, Behold, behold them ;
 And gave to Jerusalem one that bringeth good tidings."
 (xli. 26, 27.)

Isaiah, living in the Assyrian times, could not thus refer *back* to announcements formerly made of deliverance from a captivity of which his people had never yet heard. Nor could he have spoken so circumstantially as the unknown prophet does of the political events of the time of Cyrus. We can conceive of no possible reason why he should have done so, or any object to be answered by it. He refers, for example, to the want of union among the Babylonians

(xlix. 25, 26): he not only mentions Cyrus by name, but alludes to the league formed against him by the nations of western Asia; to his victories over them; and to his plans against Egypt (xli. 1, 5, xliii. 3, 4, xlv. 13, 14, li. 4—6).

It further appears that the prophet is intimately acquainted with the tendencies of certain portions of the captive people. Probably most of them were strictly faithful to Jehovah and His worship. Of these, some were eager to return to their own land, to re-build the temple and re-establish the Divine worship in Jerusalem. Others were more inclined to remain where they were, and build a temple to Jehovah in Babylonia. But some were discontented and rebellious, indifferent to the exhortations and warnings of the prophet, and negligent of the observances of their own religion; or, again, they sought to combine these with observances followed by the heathen people around them. A portion of the captives were, evidently, timid and despondent, given at times not only to doubt the possibility of deliverance, but also to fall away from their religious fidelity into the acknowledgment and service of idol deities, or even the making of idols.

Some very curious expressions occur in reference to these various topics. As we might expect, the allusions are at times not easy to understand, as we are now so imperfectly informed of the circumstances; but at all events it will be found that by referring them to the people and the time of the captivity, we are led to a comparatively consistent, rational and intelligible interpretation. On the other hand, by referring them to the age or person of Christ and the promulgation of Christianity, we are entangled at once in an inextricable maze of dark sayings, little profitable indeed for doctrine, or reproof, or correction, or instruction in righteousness, or for anything else,—unless it be for prophesying, speedily to be falsified, in reference to modern politics, the downfall of the Pope, and the end of the world, after the manner of Dr. Cumming. But some interpreters of our time, take a strange delight in double meanings, and are skilful to detect these in the various and difficult sections of Isaiah to which we are alluding; one of these meanings having reference to the circumstances of the captivity, and the other and higher sense to those of Christ and the gospel. Of course, they are at liberty thus to exercise their ingenuity,

if, as men of thought and intelligence, they can bring their minds to such a degree of subjection to a foregone theory ; and if, moreover, they can really feel themselves free so to strain and torture the sense of a book for which they profess the most unbounded reverence. For our own part, we cannot do this. The Old Testament, like the New, the prophecies as much as the Gospels, ought, we think, to be received and interpreted with at least as much respect and care as we usually give to any other ancient writing. Their authors are not, therefore, to be regarded as speaking about the most important subjects in riddles, into the meaning of which we cannot hope to penetrate ; but as men who spoke to and for the people of their time, and in reference to circumstances and interests of their own day. What these were, we must take the trouble to ascertain, so far as this is possible, with some reasonable degree of fulness and accuracy, otherwise we cannot hope to understand rightly the words we seek to interpret.

With this simple principle as our guide, let us now observe how intimate is the acquaintance which the later Isaiah manifests with the practices and feelings of his fellow-captives ; and how completely, we may add, this interpretation of his words exhausts their meaning—leaving nothing to be carried forward, so to speak, to the credit of any second and higher sense, relating to the time of Christ and the gospel.

In the greater part of the forty-fourth chapter, the prophet speaks of the idolatrous tendencies of some of his own people, and reminds them of the vanity and delusiveness of “these things.” The whole passage (vers. 9—20) is one of the most striking in the Bible, setting forth in words of strong irony the extreme folly of him “who hath formed a God, or molten a graven image :”

“He heweth him down cedars,
And taketh the ilex and the terebinth,
Which he chooseth for himself among the trees of the forest.
He planteth an ash, and the rain maketh it grow.
It also serveth for a man to burn ;
And he taketh some of it and warmeth himself ;
He also kindleth a fire and baketh bread ;
Yea, he maketh a God and worshippeth it,
He maketh a graven image and falleth down to it !
He burneth part thereof in the fire ;

With part thereof he eateth flesh ;
 He roasteth meat and is satisfied ;
 Yea, he warmeth himself, and saith,
 Aha, I am warm, I see the fire ;
 And of the residue thereof he maketh a god,
 Even his graven image !
 He falleth down unto it and worshippeth it,
 And prayeth unto it, and saith,
 Deliver me ; for thou art my god !” (xliv. 14—17.)

Many of the captives appear to have been addicted to sorcery, to the practice of strange rites in groves, even to the sacrifice of children in the valleys, lvii. 3—10. Much of this chapter is a curious picture of the depths of degradation to which some of the people had fallen, and shews us the earnestness of the remonstrances addressed to them by the faithful prophet. So, again, in lxxv., where we find the destruction of these faithless Israelites announced, with the simultaneous deliverance and blessing of Jehovah’s true servants. The commencement of lvii. evidently alludes to the miserable consequences of the religious unfaithfulness of some of the leaders. It would appear that zealous Israelites were even persecuted on account of their opposition to the corrupt practices of others. The prophet regards these sufferings of pious men as a sin-offering for his people, although, he says, this is not duly attended to or appreciated by those who ought to take warning from what they see, and who by their wicked heedlessness are bringing further punishment upon themselves :

“Thus the righteous perisheth,
 And no man layeth it to heart ;
 And merciful men are taken away,
 While none considereth that for the evil of others
 The righteous is taken away.
 He entereth into peace ;
 They rest in their beds,
 Each one who walketh in his righteousness.” (lvii. 1, 2.)

The fifty-ninth chapter gives us a fearful picture of the iniquity of some of the captives. The writer may have in his mind the misdeeds of former years as well as those of his own time ; but, at any rate, it is such iniquities which have brought suffering upon them, and which are now delaying the long hoped-for deliverance (lix. 1—15).

In the course of these reproaches, the prophet frequently addresses his countrymen in the second person. Hence they are evidently known and present to him personally. He addresses questions to them, as in xl. 18, 20, 21, xlii. 23, xlv. 5. He encourages them, and calls upon them not to be afraid (xli. 10, 14, xliii. 1, 2, xlv. 2, 8). He censures and reproaches them in the strongest language:

“Hear, ye deaf; and look up, ye blind, that ye may see;

Who is blind but my servant?

Or deaf as my messenger, whom I sent?

Who is blind as he that hath been made my friend,

So blind as the servant of Jehovah?” (xliii. 18, 19.)

In this place it is plain, and deserving of particular notice, that the collective people, but probably more especially the better and more faithful portion of them, are termed the “messenger” and “servant” of Jehovah—an observation which is not without its value in connection with the interpretation of ch. liii.

The prophet further admonishes his people to remember their allegiance to Jehovah, to return to Him, and receive the pardon of their sins (xliv. 21, 22, xlv. 12, 13, lv. 6, 7). He calls upon them from time to time to make ready for their departure, even to leave Babylon and return home, to re-establish the worship of their fathers in its ancient seat; and, in connection with this, he promises them a prosperous march through the desert and a safe arrival in their own land:

“Go ye forth from Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans:

With the voice of singing declare ye, proclaim this,

Let it go forth to the end of the earth;

Say ye, Jehovah hath redeemed his servant Jacob.

And they shall not thirst in the deserts through which he leadeth them;

He causeth the waters to flow out of the rock for them:

He shall cleave the rock also, and the waters shall gush out.”

(xlviii. 20, 21.)

With these lines may be compared the following, viz. lii. 9—12, lv. 12, 13, lxii. 10—12.

Other places shew us, still more incontrovertibly, if possible, that the writer lived among the captives. He himself is sent to comfort them, l. 4, 5, lxi. 1; and his prophetic message he will deliver in spite of the persecution which it

brought upon him from some of his opposing fellow-captives, l. 6—9. He has long spoken to his people, "from the beginning," and not in secret, xlviii. 16. His prophecies have already been in part fulfilled, xlii. 9. The prophet constantly speaks for and in the name of Jehovah, and seems almost at times to identify himself with Him, as in xlviii. 3, 6—8. He will not be silent until the glory of Jerusalem is restored and the happiness of the land renewed, lxii. 1—5. He has found little faith among his people, (liii. 1), who have sometimes despised and ill-treated him, l. 6—9, lvii. 4. All these are expressions, repeated and continuous, which it is impossible to understand except as the utterance of one who himself literally saw, and heard, and felt, and believed, and knew, by his own personal experience, even as he wrote. Isaiah, living almost two centuries before, could not with any truth or propriety say that *he* had been the object of smiting and insult to the people of the captivity.

But the prophet further laments over the duration of the adversity of his people, and the delay of deliverance. This, he says, is caused by the evil doing of the captives themselves, lix. 1—15. He calls upon Jehovah to come, "as in the ancient days," for the destruction of their oppressors, li. 9—16. He implores Him by the remembrance of His goodness manifested of old to His people, to hasten once more to their rescue, lxiii. 7—lxiv. 7:

"Oh that thou wouldest rend the heavens,
That thou wouldest come down,
That the mountains might be shaken at thy presence!
As when fire kindleth brushwood,
Or fire causeth water to boil,
To make thy name known to thine adversaries,
That the nations may tremble at thy presence!" (lxiv. 1, 2.)

Such earnest and pathetic entreaties are quite unsuitable to an imaginative anticipation of evil, such alone as Isaiah could have had, and imply throughout an actual experience on the writer's part of the miseries to which he refers.

There are some other features of this kind on which our space will not allow us to dwell. We pass on, therefore, in the next place, briefly to observe that the later prophet has many favourite expressions which are not found in the prophecies before pointed out as authentic writings of Isaiah.

Thus, for example, we have his emphatic declarations that Jehovah is the only God, and that there is none else ; and, related to these, the denunciation and scorn with which he refers to the idols,—xliii. 9—13, xlv. 6—8. Equally peculiar to the later Isaiah is his repeated assertion of the power of Jehovah and His superiority to the false deities, on the ground of His foreknowledge of events, xlv. 20, 21, and other places. The same remark applies to the conception of the Servant of Jehovah, lii. 13—liii. 12, and elsewhere,—a conception which has no parallel in the earlier portion of the book.

In regard to style and forms of expression, the difference is equally marked. There is in both writers the same elevated tone, moral and religious ; the same flow of words ; the same, or nearly the same, vivacity and force ; but the later prophet is more diffuse ; his language, on the whole, is smoother and more flowing. He is also fond of repetitions, especially in connection with certain subjects. Thus, "I am Jehovah, and there is none else ; there is no God beside me : " this form, or the equivalent, occurs several times in the two chapters, xlv. xlv. So with the phrase, "I am the first, and I am the last," xli. 4, and other places ; and with the words, "Fear thou not, for I am with thee," xli. 10, which is also several times repeated ; and there are various other instances of the same kind. He is fond of descriptive additions in connection with the name of Jehovah. It is "He that created the heavens, and stretched them out, He that spread forth the earth ; " "who made a way in the sea, and a path in the mighty waters : " it is He that formed Israel "from the womb, to be His servant,"—"who called him by his name," with numerous other additions of similar form, not to be paralleled in the writings of the earlier prophet. Then, again, he is very fond of referring to Jehovah as Israel's Creator, Maker, Redeemer, Comforter ; words which in the English version are often rendered (and disguised) by a pronoun and a verb, but which in the original are participial expressions. These are mostly unknown to the older Isaiah.

The later prophet frequently speaks of Jerusalem under the figure of a person :

"But Zion saith, Jehovah hath forsaken me,
And my Lord hath forgotten me."

(xlix. 14.)

He speaks of the Jewish people as the wife of Jehovah, l 1, liv. 1—10 :

"For thy maker is thy husband ;
Jehovah of hosts is his name ;
* * * *

For Jehovah hath recalled thee ;
As a wife forsaken and lonely in spirit,
And as the wife of one's youth,
Though thou hast been rejected, saith thy God,
For a little moment have I forsaken thee,
But with great mercies will I take thee back."

For the sake of emphasis he repeats words : "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people ;" "Behold, behold them" (xli. 27) ; "I, I Jehovah" (xlili. 11, 25) ; "For mine own sake, for mine own sake" (xlvi. 11) ; with various other examples to the same effect.

Differences equally marked may be observed in the character of the language which the two writers employ. The one, as we might expect, has a decided tendency to later words and forms ; indicating, of course, a corresponding later date of composition. On this part of the subject, however, we cannot attempt to dwell at length. We prefer to use our remaining space in a brief notice of the question, as to what or who is meant by the servant of Jehovah, spoken of in several places, but with particular details in the fifty-third chapter.

The application of this and of some related passages to Jesus Christ is, of course, well known. The question is, Can we, and ought we, so to understand it? That many of the expressions met with are remarkably applicable to Christ, is undeniable ; and if an ancient prophet had been inspired to speak in detail of the incidents of our Lord's condition and death, preserving at the same time a certain indefiniteness and mystery such as might arouse the interest and wonder of his readers, we can hardly conceive of words better adapted to such a purpose than those which we read in several of these passages. But, on the other hand, let us fairly weigh the considerations of an opposite character which present themselves.

First, we may observe that immediately before this section (lii. 13—liii. 12) the prophet is obviously speaking of the approaching deliverance from Babylon. He calls upon

the waste places of Jerusalem to break forth into joy at the prospect, and declares that "all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God." He then turns to the captive people, and abruptly addresses them, telling them to depart and go out from "the midst of her," from the midst of the unclean city. The Levites, "who carry the vessels of Jehovah," are to take care that they be ritually pure, for that they need not haste nor fear, led and guarded as they are by the God of Israel. Then, introduced with even greater abruptness, comes the remarkable section relating to the servant of Jehovah. And, immediately following this, the great subject of the deliverance recurs. The barren and desolate city of Jerusalem (liv.) is called upon to sing aloud at the thought of the future multitudes of her children; she that has been "afflicted, tempest-tossed, disconsolate," is now to be at peace, rebuilt, restored to prosperity and beauty, fit "heritage of the servants of Jehovah." Seeing, then, how the thoughts of the writer are thus, even here, fixed upon the one most absorbing theme of all these chapters, the coming deliverance of the chosen people, is it probable that he breaks off in the midst of these earnest and enraptured strains, so clearly relating to what lies immediately before him, to speak with such abruptness, without any kind of explanation to his readers, of one so far away in the distant future as Jesus Christ? Or did the prophet here, too, only make a *mistake* of five or six centuries,—as the Sub-dean of Wells tells us he did in the case of Ahaz and the child Immanuel? We cannot lose sight of the fact that the sacred writer lived not less than five hundred years before the Christian era. What he said about the servant of Jehovah, if it referred to the sufferings of Christ, was not only incomprehensible to his contemporaries, but was by their descendants for many generations entirely misunderstood. Such a personage as a suffering Messiah was, in truth, unknown to the Jews, and is not known to the Old Testament. That long-expected deliverer was to be a victorious and prosperous leader of his people; and necessarily so; otherwise neither hope nor encouragement could have been derived by them from the prospect of his advent. The conclusion, therefore, seems to be inevi-

* Theol. Rev., Vol. III. p. 19.

table, that the Servant in this place stands in close connection with the circumstances amidst which the prophet is writing ; and that the application of the passage to Christ, appropriate as in some respects it might appear, was one that was made only after the event. No doubt, the Christian writers, both the Apostles and the Fathers, speedily observed how well the passage corresponded to some of the circumstances of their Master's career and death ; and it was natural for them, with their ideas of prophecy, so to use it. But there is nothing whatever in the passage itself, as it stands in its original connection, to require or to justify such a use of it—but exactly the reverse.

In the second place, it is not difficult to see that some of the expressions do not suit the particular case of Christ at all. In what sense was he "exalted and lifted up," or "very high"? (lii. 13). How, or when, were many "amazed" at him? (v. 14). In what sense was his grave "with the wicked"? (liii. 9). How had he "a portion with the great" or how did he "divide the spoil with the strong"? (v. 12). In these and some other particulars, the words are unsuitable to our Lord, in any plain and direct sense ; and if we can find a more appropriate application for them, it is evident that we are called upon to do so.

To this end, we may notice that the chief passages in which the "Servant" is mentioned may be divided into two classes. These we have indicated in the note below,* and numbered respectively (1) and (2). The former will be seen to prove that the object of the prophet's thoughts is not *one* person, but many ; although so often, by a kind of proso-popœia, conceived of and addressed as a single individual. He appears sometimes to have in his mind the whole of the captive people. Thus in xliii 10,—

"Ye are my witnesses, saith Jehovah,
And my servant whom I have chosen."

Again :

"Yet hear, now, O Jacob, my servant,
And Israel whom I have chosen ;
Thus saith Jehovah, who made thee,
And formed thee from the womb and helpeth thee ;

* (1.) xli. 8, 9, xlii. 19, xliii. 10, xliv. 1, 2, xlv. 4, xlvi. 20 (comp Jer. xlv. 27, 28).—(2.) xlii. 1—7, xliv. 21, l. 10, lii. 13—liii. 12.

Fear not, O Jacob my servant,
And thou Jeshurun whom I have chosen." (xliv. 1, 2.)

The other instances cited under the first head are of the same somewhat general character, denoting all the captives, whom the prophet evidently regards as the future instrument of spreading the true religion in the world, after their deliverance from their present adversity. But we have to bear in mind that the whole people were not equally faithful. Some, as we have seen, were addicted to idolatry. Many were obstinate, and turned a deaf ear to the promise of deliverance. They even persecuted the more consistent and faithful Israelites, including the prophet himself (l, lvi. 9—lvii. 11). Their transgressions it is which cause the deliverance to be delayed (lix.). There is another section of the people not so bad as these. They are only religiously indifferent, and often neglectful of the requirements of the law; or they combine their obedience as Israelites, ceremonial observances, such as fasting and the keeping of days, with a good deal of practical wickedness. This may be seen in ch. lviii. At the same time they complain of the delay of Jehovah in coming to their deliverance, or doubt even the possibility of it (xlix. 14, 24, liii. 1). Thus we may expect that the prophet will sometimes distinguish between the *whole* people (including the faithful and righteous equally with the more negligent and idolatrous) and a smaller section, more perfectly true to their allegiance, comparatively upright, strict in their religious duties, and willing or eager to return home and restore the temple worship in Jerusalem. To this party, doubtless, the prophet himself belonged, with many others not named by him, but included among those whom Ezra mentions as heads of families and leaders, on the return from captivity. This party, again, are those more particularly referred to in the second class of passages above given. These passages, accordingly, introduce us to a smaller and more select portion of the captives:

"Behold my servant, whom I uphold,
My chosen one, in whom my soul delighteth;
I have put my spirit upon him,
He shall publish right among the nations.

I Jehovah have called thee for deliverance,
And will hold thy hand and will keep thee,
VOL. III. 2 Q

And give thee to be a covenant of the people,
 A light of the nations ;
 To open the blind eyes,
 To bring forth the captive from the prison,
 Them that sit in darkness out of the prison house."

(xlii. 1, 6, 7).

In some places the prophet speaks in the name of the "Servant," and even seems to identify himself with him ; probably, however, only representatively. So in xlix. 1—9. The same representation occurs substantially in other places. The longest section is in lii. 13—liii. 12, where, however, the writer speaks (for Jehovah) of "my servant," while still, throughout the passage separating himself from him, as from a clearly distinct object of contemplation. He refers to the incredulity and neglect with which his own (?) promises and exhortations have been received ; to the evil treatment which Jehovah's servant has met with at the hands of some of the more powerful of his fellow-captives ; perhaps, also, by their instigation, at the hands of their common masters, the Babylonians ; he speaks of these sufferings of the best portion of the nation as possessed of an expiatory efficacy for the sins of the people, according to ancient Jewish ideas. The many have gone astray ; while he, "my righteous servant," the collective faithful among the captives,

"— hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows ;
 And we did esteem him stricken,
 Smitten of God, and afflicted.
 But he was wounded for our transgressions,
 Bruised for our iniquities :
 The chastisement of our peace was upon him,
 And with his stripes we are healed.

* * * *

And who of his generation considereth
 That he was cut off out of the land of the living
 For the transgression of my people, stricken for them ?"

(liii. 4, 5, 8.)

The expiation thus wrought will prove to be for the blessing of the whole people ; and in spite of their transgressions, their unfaithfulness and idolatries, they shall yet be restored to their own land. The righteous sufferer by these evil deeds

“— shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days,
And the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand.

By his knowledge my righteous servant shall make many
righteous,
For he shall bear their iniquities.” (vers. 10, 11.)

The last chapter of the series concludes as the first began, with an emphatic announcement of the promise of deliverance and future prosperity. The faithful shall rejoice in Jerusalem and “exult in her;” they shall “be delighted with the abundance of her glory.” But upon all His enemies Jehovah shall execute judgment; the unfaithful, the obstinate, the idolatrous, shall “be consumed together”:—

“And they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses
Of the men that have transgressed against me;
For their worm shall not die,
Neither shall their fire be quenched;
And they shall be an abhorrence unto all flesh.”
(lxvi. 23.)

In conclusion, we must express the conviction that, if there be one thing which the biblical learning of the last half century has established beyond the possibility of effectual dispute, it is this, that the last twenty-seven chapters of this book are from the pen, not of the prophet Isaiah, but of a writer who lived a century and a half after his time, and in the time of the captivity; and that the various contents of those chapters—their joyful anticipations of speedy deliverance, and of the prevalence of true religion among the Gentiles as the consequence of that deliverance; their allusions to the wickedness and idolatry of some of the captives, and to the religious faithfulness of others; their picture of the ill-treated and despised Servant of Jehovah, whose sufferings nevertheless are to contribute to the final result—that all this relates, not to the promulgation of Christianity, the triumphs of the gospel, or the sufferings and death of our Lord Jesus Christ,—ideas which probably never entered the mind of this earnest writer,—but simply and solely to the events and circumstances and hopes and fears of the very time in which the prophet lived and wrote.

It is marvellous, to our minds, that men of undoubted intelligence and piety can close their eyes to this conclusion and refuse to acknowledge its truth. That they do so, is to

us only an illustration and proof of the power of a long-established system to enchain or fascinate those who have been educated under its influence. To do so seems to be like refusing to acknowledge the light of the sun. But then we may not judge for others, and would only add with the apostle, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." The truth in this matter, as in others, can doubtless well afford to wait for its due recognition in the world; and, in spite of all opposition and discouragement, we may still seek to feel and to say, with the great prophet on whose words we have been dwelling,

"Who is he among you that feareth Jehovah,
That hearkeneth to the voice of his servant,
That walketh in darkness and hath no light ?
Let him trust in the name of Jehovah,
And rely upon his God."

(L 10).

GEORGE VANCE SMITH.

VL—THE GOSPEL QUESTION.—2. THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THUS, as far as external evidence goes, there is no proof of the apostolic authorship of the fourth Gospel; the balance of evidence inclines weightily the other way. The possibility even of apostolic authorship seems excluded by the non-appearance of the writing until the middle of the second century. Nevertheless, a question remains, whether an examination of the Gospel itself may not lead to inferences so cogent as to reverse this verdict. It is therefore requisite to inquire further, what conclusions would properly follow from a dispassionate examination of the writing itself—of its literary style and composition—of its matter and contents—of any declarations or intimations of authorship which may be met with in it. But in order to counterbalance the conclusion to which the examination of the external evidence has already led us, it would be necessary for the language and contents of the Gospel to be thoroughly in unison with what we might reasonably expect from a Palestinian Jew of no great refinement or education, and that any intimations of authorship should be unambiguous and explicit.

The Greek of the fourth Gospel is confessedly the purest of any to be met with in the New Testament ; and relatively to the Gospels it surpasses as a composition the third Gospel, which is itself not devoid of literary merit. The language and diction, on the most superficial inspection, is not such as would be characteristic of a Galilean peasant. Besides which, and still apart from any consideration of its special contents, its general structure is highly artificial. Long before modern criticism discovered "tendency" in any of the other Gospels, a doctrinal purpose was acknowledged in the fourth, which, in fact, gives a unity to it as a whole, while in detail it abounds with artificial contrasts, verbal surprises and dialectical subtleties, foreign altogether to the style which would be native to such a person as John the fisherman. And we must not allow ourselves to fall into the inconsistency of dwelling on the rudeness and ignorance of the fishermen of Galilee, when we would enhance the wonder of the work which they accomplished in converting a world, and then attribute, without difficulty or hesitation, to one of those "unlearned and ignorant men" * a composition of so much skill and beauty as the fourth Gospel—to say nothing at present of its theological, metaphysical, or mystical peculiarities.

If we turn now from observation of the language and literary characteristics of the Gospel to the consideration of the general character of its contents, we do not find it at all such a composition as would coincide with the range of thought of a Palestinian Jew. We are sufficiently acquainted from the other Gospels, from the writings of Josephus, and from the apocryphal books, such as the Book of Enoch, the fourth Book of Esdras, the Ascension of Isaiah, with the nature of the Messianic expectations generally entertained among the Jewish people at the commencement of the Christian era. The Messianic ideas which belonged to the Jew of Palestine would necessarily, and without any imputation on his good faith, colour his historical recollections, and his expectations of the future reign of Christ would be such as we meet with in Matt. xxiv. and in the Apocalypse.

The contrast, indeed, both in diction and in sentiment, between our fourth Gospel and such a Gospel as we should

* *ἀνθρώποι ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται*.—Acts iv. 13.

have expected from an apostle of Jesus Christ, is most forcibly suggested when we compare the Gospel with the book of the Revelation. Very different judgments have, it is true, been formed at various times as to the authorship and canonical character of the Apocalypse—fluctuations which have been due principally to variations of opinion relative to millenarian expectations. And it is now very generally acknowledged that, as the millenarianism of the first and second centuries died out, the Apocalypse necessarily fell into disrepute. By the Protestants and Reformed, it has been highly esteemed by reason of the predictions supposed to be contained in it of the downfall of the Papacy. But very many, who by no means adopt these views, agree in believing it to have been one of the earliest Christian writings;—of the date, that is to say, of 68, and anterior to all the rest of the New Testament, except the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans and Thessalonians. In this very ancient Christian monument, the style and diction, together with the religious conceptions, correspond with what we should anticipate from a Christian of Palestinian origin, and from a person such as we suppose the apostle John to have been. But the dissimilarity in these particulars between the Apocalypse and the Gospel is so great, that, since the time of De Wette, this at least has been the conclusion of almost all critics, that the two books cannot have had the same author: if the Apocalypse belongs to the apostle, the Gospel does not, and *vice versa*.

These considerations, however, are merely general. Have we any data concerning the apostle John himself which would enable us to judge of his personal competency to produce such a composition as the fourth Gospel? In the first place, he is represented, as we have seen, in the Acts of the Apostles, as “an unlearned and ignorant man;” and in the other Gospels he is known as one of the “Sons of Thunder” (Mark iii. 17); as forbidding those who followed not with the apostles (Luke ix. 49; Mark ix. 38); as ready to call down fire from heaven, “even as Elias did,” on those who refused their Master’s teaching (Luke ix. 54), and as making request for an exalted place in a kingdom of Messiah, of which the scene was to be on earth (Matt. xx. 21; Mark x. 37; comp. Matt. xix. 28). It is true we are not able, as yet at least, to decide as to the authenticity of such par-

ticular facts or particular conversations narrated in the first three Gospels. But for our present purpose it is sufficient that these were early Christian writings, and we may take any scattered notices in them concerning the apostle as conveying the primitive Christian tradition. It is only in the fourth Gospel itself, the genuineness and authenticity of which are now under examination, wherein he is characterized as the "beloved disciple," "who leaned on Jesus' breast at supper-time." There is, moreover, a notice, though incidental, of undoubted genuineness, in St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, where John is described as one of the "pillar-apostles," and where, together with Peter and James, he is "an apostle of the circumcision," as Paul of the uncircumcision. Now the Apocalypse might very well have been written by an apostle of the circumcision, and by one in a certain antagonism to Paul, or to parts of his teaching. Not only is a large part of the imagery in that book derived from circumstances of the temple worship and the visions of Ezekiel, but the sealed ones of the tribes of Israel are privileged above the other servants of God gathered out of the Gentiles. The New Jerusalem is not a heavenly Jerusalem in the sense of St. Paul (*ἡ ἀνω Ἱερουσαλήμ*, Gal. iv. 26), nor the 144,000 a "seed of Abraham" in the purely spiritual meaning of the same apostle (Gal. iii. 29). The strictly Jewish standing-point of the author of the Revelation is seen at ii. 9: "I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not;" and iii. 9: "Which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie." The reference to St. Paul can hardly be mistaken when it is said to the church of Ephesus, "Thou canst not bear them which are evil, and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars" (ii. 2). And again, there is an allusion to his liberal solution of the case of conscience concerning eating meats offered or consecrated to idols (1 Cor. viii. 4, 9, 10; x. 19, 20, 25, 27), which is described as a doctrine of Balaam and of Jezebel, teaching "to eat things sacrificed unto idols" (Rev. ii. 14, 20). The council at Jerusalem, at which John belonged to the leading party, had settled this matter concerning *εἰδωλόθυρα* in general terms; St. Paul to the Corinthians had drawn a reasonable distinction, which, however, we can well understand would be regarded by

the strict Judaical party as profane and apostata. With the strong Judaizing tone of the Apocalypse, the fourth Gospel has nothing in common; "the Jews" represent not a chosen people, but a people loving darkness rather than light; they sustain, in the discourses of the Gospel, the part, as it were, of devil's advocates; there is nothing of a scenic judgment, nor any prospect of a continuance or renewal of a worship of which the centre should be Jerusalem; it is expressly excluded in such words as these: "The time cometh, when neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father."

There is no doubt some difficulty in assigning the Apocalypse to the apostle John, or to any of the apostles, for in that case the writer would be speaking inclusively of himself among the "holy apostles and prophets" (xviii. 20) and "the twelve apostles of the Lamb" (xxi. 14), which is not very easy to suppose he would do. On the other hand, as the date of the Apocalypse may be taken as fixed to the year 68, we must suppose all the apostles, John among them, to have been already dead, and the Revelation to have been written by one of the same name, to be distinguished both from the apostle and from John of Ephesus, and from the author of the Gospel and Epistle. It is not, however, at all necessary for our present purpose to decide as to the authorship of the Apocalypse, for it is only referred to here as illustrating the style and tone of thought which would have been natural to the apostle John, and with which those of the Gospel are altogether at variance; and the inference is nearly as cogent against the Gospel's being the genuine work of the apostle if its diction and sentiments are obviously dissimilar from those of the Apocalypse, supposed to be the work of an unknown Palestinian convert, as if that work could be assigned to his authorship by sufficient historical evidence. For, as far as we have any means of judging, the Greek of the apostle John would have been equally Hebraistic; and putting aside altogether the mere imagery of the book, his conceptions of the coming reign of Messiah would have been equally mundane, and he would have assigned to the Jew a like superiority in that future kingdom.

It is said, however, and with some truth, that there are remarkable ideas and expressions common both to the Gospel

and to the Apocalypse ; and it is essential to consider what is the extent of the similarity, and what may be the fair inference from it. Both in the Gospel and in the Apocalypse Jesus is termed "the Word," or the "Word of God" (John i 1 ; Rev. xix. 13) ; in both he is called the "Lamb of God ;" in both is a piercing mentioned, and with citation of Zech. xii. 10, not according to the Septuagint, but according to some other rendering of the Hebrew. Both in the Gospel and Apocalypse the figurative expression occurs of "water of life ;" in both is Jesus called "Son of God" (Rev. ii. 18) and "Son of Man" (Rev. i. 13). We will take these similarities in their reverse order. The designations "Son of God" and "Son of Man," are, as is well known, common throughout the New Testament writings, and they were current among Jews of all schools as titles of Messiah. Jesus is called "Son of God" in the Ascension of Isaiah, the work of a Palestinian Jew, and supposed by Laurence to be of the year 68 ; and in the first Book of Esdras,* of Alexandrian origin, he is spoken of as "the Man," and also as "that Son," and God calls him "my Son," and it is said, "My Messiah, my Child, shall die ;" and in the book of Enoch, which abounds in parallelisms with the Apocalypse, the Messiah is the "Elected one," "the Judge of the world," the "Son of Man," the "Son of woman," who yet pre-existed together with "the other" or the "concealed one" in the presence of "the Ancient of Days," "before the world was created and for ever," and "has revealed to the saints and to the righteous the wisdom of the Lord of spirits." There is a rudimentary doctrine of a Trinity in the Book of Enoch, as there is in the Ascension of Isaiah, and as there is in the fourth Gospel ; but no one would thence infer a common authorship for the three works. The rudimentary Trinity, if we may be pardoned the phrase, is much more defined in the two apocryphal works than it is in the Apocalypse. And they approach the Apocalypse much more nearly than they do the fourth Gospel in the Messianic features and the celestial attributes which they give to Jesus. They are clearly not of the same school or form of thought with the fourth Gospel ; but still less is the fourth Gos-

* The fourth, according to the Vulgate, and 2 Esdras in the Apocrypha of the English version : see ii. 43—47 ; vii. 28, 29 ; xiii. 3, 12, 26, 32, 37, 52 ; xiv. 9 ; although the mention of Jesus by name, vii. 28, is no doubt a Christian interpolation.

pel in unison with the Apocalypse; that is to say, is not in unison with it on these especial points of the nature and character of Jesus the Son of Man and Son of God. It may be said (which may be noticed here as conveniently as elsewhere), that the differences, both literary and dogmatical, between the two works, the Gospel and Apocalypse, may be sufficiently accounted for on the supposition of a considerable interval of time, say thirty years, having intervened between the composition of them, a period which would allow of the acquirement of an improved style and of an increased spiritual insight. We are not here dealing with the subject on the hypothesis of a miraculous inspiration having been given to the apostle, which, as both works were posterior to the Pentecostal effusion, would occasion as many difficulties as it would solve; but unless we were to suppose that, as the works in question are alleged to have been those of an apostle, and that miraculous intervention may be invoked to account for any inconsistencies which are otherwise insoluble, we must apply the same tests in judging of their authorship as we should in the case of compositions not comprised in the Bible. Now it is extremely improbable so great difference as is obvious between the Greek of the Gospel and of the Apocalypse would be due to changes operated in the last thirty years of the apostle's life: the period during which such a transition might be natural would rather lie between the ages of 30 and 60 or 70, than between 70 and 100. If at the age of 70 the apostle's style abounded with Hebraisms, it is extremely improbable they should have altogether disappeared from it at the age even of 100. Nor is it at all more probable that within the closing period of a long life there should have developed itself the peculiar mystical and metaphysical theology of the Gospel in a mind to which it had been entirely foreign in the prime of life. But if it is not possible to account for the differences between the works on the supposition of both of them belonging to the apostle, there is no difficulty in accounting for their points of contact or resemblance on the supposition of their being due to different authors: a change or development which is inconceivable in an individual mind, is very conceivable within a community.

Nor can any inference concerning unity of authorship be drawn from the occurrence in the two books of figurative expressions derived from the element of water. These are

met with, Rev. vii. 16, 17; xxi. 6; xxii. 1; and in the Gospel, iv. 14; vii. 37—39: in the former cases, however, the metaphor is employed to signify the future life or condition of happiness; in the latter, as an emblem of the spiritual life derived by the believer from the doctrine of Christ, faith in him, and the gift of his spirit. The figure is, however, so common in the Old Testament writings, that it was a common property of all who were familiar with them. "The waters of comfort" of the Psalmist; the "Come every one to the waters, without money and without price," of Isaiah, would furnish imagery to be employed by various writers according to their several purposes. The applications of the metaphor in the Old Testament might be distributed, at least with plausibility, into the apocalyptic and the spiritual; but it is unnecessary; only it may be observed that in the Book of Enoch we meet likewise with the "fountain of righteousness," "the springs of wisdom," of which "all the thirsty drink and are filled with wisdom" (Enoch xlviii. 1).

The piercing of the side of Jesus on the cross is peculiar in the Gospel narratives to the fourth. The author lays great stress upon the circumstance, and beholds in it the fulfilment of a scripture, Zech. xii. 10, which he cites, not according to the LXX. version, but according to the Hebrew. In like manner the author of the Apocalypse cites the same text with a similar deviation; hence is frequently inferred the identity of the authors. The "looking," indeed, of the evangelist is that of the bystanders at the crucifixion when the wound was inflicted; the "looking" in the Apocalypse is at the day of judgment, when they who wounded him shall look with fear upon their Judge. Nor does the purpose of the reference, or leading thought, seem to have been the same with the two writers. The purpose of the evangelist was not, indeed, to furnish a proof of death, as is imagined by frigid compilers of "Evidences," but to suggest significant emblems of spiritual life; but there is nothing of this kind in the passage in the Revelation. In the Gospel, the event is set forth as a foundation of faith; in the Apocalypse, as a warning of retribution. In the Gospel, the wound and its issue are accentuated; in the Apocalypse, the beholders: in the Gospel, "he that saw it bare record, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true,

that ye may believe ;" in the Apocalypse, "he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also (or, 'the very men who,' *οἱ τινες*) which pierced him, and all the tribes of the earth shall wail because of him." The similarity is thus reduced to the mere verbal one of a citation from Zechariah in nearly the same form of Greek, for the two citations do in fact vary somewhat: in the Gospel, the stricter rendering would be, "they shall see him at whom they shot;" in the Apocalypse, "and the very men who shot him."*

It would be altogether unreasonable, therefore, on so weak a ground to argue the necessary identity of the two authors: two persons intending to represent the same Hebrew text might be expected very well to approximate in their rendering; but any variation, slight as it may be, tells more for the diversity of the authors, than a mere coincidence in citation of the same text can do for their identity. No satisfactory account has yet been given of the mode in which the writers of the New Testament cite the ancient Scriptures; of the extent to which their citations correspond with or deviate from the Hebrew, or the Septuagint, or both; of the manner in which they sometimes appear to argue from misunderstandings or mistranslations, and to run different texts into each other without seeming to be aware of it. It is not likely that any one hypothesis will be sufficient to account for all the phenomena. But this supposition must not be omitted among others, that besides the Hebrew Scriptures, and one or more Greek versions of them as a whole, there were extant collections of Texts, or Scripture Commonplace-books, used in the instructions of Scribes and Doctors, and which might have a currency from their portability which would not belong to the entire Scriptures in manuscript. These collections would even naturally follow from the direction of the Law to write out and carry about portions of its precepts. This supposition furnishes the most probable account which can be given of the occurrence of strings of quotations, such as are met with in St. Paul to the Romans (iii. 10—18), in the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 5—13; iv. 3—7), in the Epistle of Clement to the Corin-

* John xix. 37: "Ὁψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκίνησαν. Rev. i. 7: "Ὁψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὁφθαλμὸς, καὶ οἱ τινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκίνησαν.

thians (viii. xv. xxxix.), in Justin Martyr throughout. The connections were ready to hand in the commonplace-book of the individual. And thus two authors falling on the same text in their note-books, in illustration whether of the same or of different subjects, might very well quote it with a difference of reading as well as with a difference of application. In fact, there is nothing to shew that the application of the quoted text is the same in the Apocalypse as in the Gospel. We are apt to understand it in reference to the piercing of the side mentioned in the Gospel, and to think that it must imply a like piercing in the mind's eye of the older writer in the Revelation. But there is nothing in *κεντέω* or its compounds which necessarily or properly signifies a spear-wound such as is described in the Gospel: although in the LXX. it sometimes implies spear and blade wounds.* At any rate, the quotation in the Apocalypse would be sufficiently accounted for, if we suppose the author to have been thinking of the wounds in the hands and feet, or even in the hands only, for the wounding of the feet is not so certain. For his own purpose, the same text might then very well be afterwards quoted by the evangelist, whether he knew or not of its citation in the Apocalypse. And there is a very pertinent illustration of the employment of another compound of the word *κεντέω* to the wounding of Christ in a manner that excludes the notion of a blade-wound, to be met with in the Epistle of the pseudo-Barnabas, a work of uncertain date, it is true, but which must, at all events, lie between the Revelation and the Gospel. The author sees in the ceremonies of the Law prophetic emblems of events recorded in the Gospel, among which he brings forward the treatment of the "scape-goat," which is described as spitting on and piercing, and crowning with scarlet wool, and sending forth into the wilderness,† where the piercing could not have been any great or fatal wound. And afterwards, "they shall see him in

* *Ἐκεντέω pungo, stimulo, transfigo.* In versione Alex. non solum verbo *קָדַח* Jud. ix. 54. Thren. iv. 9 [*thrust through, stricken through*] et *קָדַח* Jes. xiv. 19 [*thrust through*] sed etiam *קָדַח* [slay] Num. xxii. 29, respondet. Schleusner.

† Προσίχετε πῶς ὁ τύπος τοῦ θεοῦ φανεροῦται καὶ ἐμπτύσατε πάντες καὶ κατακινήσατε καὶ περιθετε τὸ ἑριον τὸ κόκκινον περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ οὕτως εἰς ἔρημον βληθήτω.

that day with the scarlet robe, and shall say, Is not this he whom we crucified and spat upon?"* The Epistle of Barnabas, therefore, confirms the supposition that the piercing mentioned in the Apocalypse is a piercing of the nails or thorns, while the looking on is, as in that book, a looking on Jesus at his coming in the last day; and not, as in the Gospel, a looking on at the infliction of a wound in the dead body on the cross; which we have reason to conclude is, strictly speaking, peculiar to the evangelist, supplies no clue of connection with any other primitive composition, and is a feature of the passion apparently of late invention.

We next consider whether any and what inference relative to the Johannean authorship of the Gospel can be drawn from the usage of the phrase "Lamb of God." Supposing the Apocalypse to be the work of the apostle, would it follow that because Jesus is therein spoken of as the Lamb of God and likewise in the Gospel, this also must be his work? Apart from the fourth Gospel, there is no evidence or intimation that during his ministry Jesus ever described himself, or was designated by those about him, as the slain Lamb, or as the Lamb of God in any sense. The resembling of him to a sacrifice could only take place in the minds of his disciples after his death, and naturally would so take place, especially when the sacrifices of the Law of Moses, together with its other ordinances, were now vanishing away. So Christ had been already described by St. Paul as "our passover sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7); his blood is also spoken of in the first Epistle of Peter as that of "a Lamb without blemish and without spot;"† the author of the Acts makes Philip apply to Christ the passage from Isaiah, "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and as a lamb dumb before the shearer" (Acts viii. 32; Is. liii. 7); a great part of the argument in the Epistle to the Hebrews turns upon the idea of Christ's bloodshedding being more precious and effectual than the blood of bulls and of goats offered under the Law. With evidence of a wide-spread Christian sentiment regarding Jesus Christ as figuratively or mystically a sacrificial victim,

* ὁφονται αὐτὸν τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν ποδὴν ἔχοντα τὸν κόκκινον περὶ τὴν σάρκα καὶ ἱεροῦσιν θυχ οὗτος ἵστιν ὃν τότε ἡμεῖς ἱσταυρώσαμεν καὶ ἐξ ουθενήσαμεν καὶ ἱμπτυσάντες.

† τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου χριστοῦ.—c. i. 19.

and specially as the paschal victim, it would be extremely weak to infer a community of authorship between two books on the ground of such an emblem occurring in each. That it is substantially the same emblem must be allowed, although the Apocalypse has *ἀρίων*; in the Gospel, the Acts, and Epistle of Peter it is *ἀμνός*. Now one purpose of the fourth Gospel was to identify Jesus with the true paschal lamb; he was not only represented by it, he was it; and therefore in this Gospel Jesus does not celebrate the Passover with his disciples before he suffers, but suffers on the Passover-day, being the true Paschal Lamb himself. In the Apocalypse, the "Lamb as it had been slain," is poetical imagery, like the "Lion of the tribe of Judah" (v. 5, 6); in the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" of the Gospel, is developed doctrine and a mystical identity. To recognize in that phrase a mere sentimental description of a man of a lamb-like innocence, is a singular instance of modern frigidity; but to allege it as a proof of apostolic authorship, or even as consistent with it, would amount to charging the apostle with having represented the disciples following Christ as the Lamb of God at a time when they could not have understood how the term could possibly be applicable to him.

It remains to notice that in the Gospel Jesus is termed "the Word," and in the Apocalypse the "Word of God." In the latter, the conqueror upon the white horse shall have his name called "the Word of God" (xix. 13), with which may be compared a subsequent verse, "and hath upon his vesture and on his thigh his name written, 'King of kings and Lord of lords'" (ver. 16). Here ought well to be observed, that the calling of a name in Biblical phrase is a different thing from what we understand in modern times by the giving of a proper individual name. Even in the instances of illustrative names, such as Jacob, Naomi, they are frequently not to be taken as singular names applicable to no other individual, but as descriptive appellatives of a class. "Is he not rightly named Jacob, for he hath supplanted me these two times?"—as much as to say, There are many supplanters; this surely is one. "Thou shalt call his name Emmanuel," not meaning that in the damsel's child should be beheld a singular manifestation of divine presence, much less should be an incarnation of Deity, but should be one

among many such manifestations. And so names become rather descriptions or mottoes. "Unto us a child is born—and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father;" that is, they shall have occasion to say so in respect of him, or *apropos* of him—in some such way as striking events provoke among the Moslems the exclamation, "God is great!" Thus, in the way of a motto, it is said, "And the name of the city from that day shall be, The Lord is there" (Ezek. cxlviii. 35); and in the way of a motto, and not of an identical name, is it prophesied of the "righteous Branch," "This is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness" (Jer. xxiii. 6). That the calling of the name amounts to no more in this last instance, which is extremely applicable to our present purpose, is evident from the employment of the same formula in respect of Jerusalem: "In those days shall Judah be saved and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness" (Jer. xxxiii. 16).^{*} And thus with reference to Hebrew idiom, on which the expression is founded, the bearing of the name upon his vesture and his thigh of King of kings and Lord of lords by the rider on the white horse, does not identify him with the Divine personality; nor the assertion that his name is the Word of God predicate of him proper deity, or declare that the Word of God is a personality in God himself. It may be very true that neither does the prologue of the fourth Gospel assert a distinct personality of the Logos within the personality of the Divine Being, but it at least recognizes in the Logos a metaphysical entity co-existent with, essential to, comprehended in, co-eternal with God, and without which, it may be said, God would not be what He is. It is that function of Deity whereby all things become (*πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*)—not "by whom all things were made," as by an artificer working outside of his material—and if all things, man. It is the source of all which is highest, noblest and best: if there be lights, it is the source of light; if there be living things, it is life; if there be reasonable beings, it is reason; if there be voluntary agents, it is will. In such a doctrine there is no-

* It makes no difference whether the phrase be *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ* or simply *יְהוָה*, or *אֱלֹהֵינוּ* without *יְהוָה*.

thing necessarily Christian, or necessarily Jewish. It might be held apart from any belief in, or even any knowledge of, the person of Jesus Christ. It was doctrine current in various forms, and was laid down in this Gospel as an axiomatic basis which would not be disputed by a considerable school, and on which an exposition of the person and work of Jesus, as conceived or adapted by the writer, might be reared. And that the prologue was a piece of theology current and ready to hand, serving as a convenient introduction to the historical illustration which was to follow, is confirmed by the fact that the formulæ met with in it concerning "the Word" do not recur in any subsequent part of the Gospel. It serves a special purpose, and is then done with. In the connection wherein it stands it amounts to this—the Divine Reason is the ground of all existences, specially of good as contrasted with evil, of light as opposed to darkness, of truth as contradicted by falsehood; it is incarnate in all men, but perfectly manifested in Jesus Christ. We are not now arguing the abstract truth of such a doctrine, or maintaining its sufficiency, or reconciling the monism of vv. 1—3 with the dualism of vv. 5, 10, 11, only pointing out that "the Word" of the Gospel is connected with an entirely different set of theological conceptions from "the Word of God" in the Revelation, and supplies no ground whatever for supposing an identity of authorship or any literary affinity between the two works. And thus all the special instances sometimes relied on to prove such an identity, when they are examined, are found to tend very strongly to an opposite conclusion. On the other hand are evidences which negative the supposition of the composer of the Gospel having been a Jew of Palestine.

In the first place may be taken remarkable omissions, as in the absence of all reference to opinions with which a Palestinian would be thoroughly imbued. Neither Hades nor Gehenna are mentioned or described, which occur frequently in the other Gospels and in the Apocalypse; there is not the least allusion to demoniacal possession, which is so prominent in the miraculous narratives of the other evangelists. Undoubtedly these omissions were made by design; in the latter case, at least, the author must have been familiar with stories of possession which were current in the Church even in the second century. But as the cure of the possessed

was a power most frequently claimed by the Christians, so it was one which was imputed by their adversaries to magic, nor was it claimed exclusively by the Christians. Hence a sufficient explanation of the omission of all mention of demoniacs if the Gospel were written in the middle of the second century, but not so if it were written in the first by a person who had been eye-witness of such cures by the agency of Jesus Christ. To one writing with the doctrinal purpose manifested in the fourth Gospel, of representing the indwelling in Jesus Christ of the Divine Reason, of his being the fountain of life and light and love to all of mankind who were capable of being drawn to the Father, the expulsion of a demon, supposing him to have acknowledged its possibility, would have been an exhibition of power unworthy of record; to the Jew of Palestine in the first century, it would be the most striking characteristic of the supremacy of Messiah over the kingdom of Satan. Nor, again, is it intelligible that a Jew of Palestine should have omitted in his record of the discourses of Jesus those characteristic parables which according to the other Gospels formed so large a portion of them, and which John himself must have heard. But it would be quite consistent with the design of a writer in the second century, desirous of conciliating Christianity with Gnosticism, to set forth a spiritual Gospel, delivering the higher knowledge supposed to have been communicated to the apostles, and especially to the bosom disciple in secret, from which those rudimentary forms of instruction would therefore be omitted.

In estimating the importance of actual errors into which the author has fallen, but which would not have been possible to the apostle John, we must bear in mind the particular inquiry with which we are now engaged, which is at this stage concerning the genuineness of the Gospel, and not concerning the authenticity of its contents. For errors in etymology, in geography, in the description of national customs, which would have little weight in detracting from the general credibility of a history otherwise established on sufficient testimony, may be altogether decisive to negative the authorship of a book in which they occur by a particular person or description of person. Thus the author undertakes to explain the meaning of Hebrew names occurring in his narrative, and he explains even such well-known

terms as Cephas (i. 42) and Rabbi (i. 38), which it is difficult to suppose could have required explanation with any persons to whom the apostle John can be imagined to have written. But it would be inexplicable that he should have fallen into such an error as to say that "Siloam is by interpretation, Sent," or "one sent," ἀπεσταλμένος (ix. 7). It is acknowledged that such cannot be the meaning of the word Siloam or Siloah, though it may be derived from the root שָׁלַח (he sent). The extrication from this "difficulty" is, as with Lücke, to suppose the words, "which is by interpretation, Sent," to be an interpolation; but they are uniformly present in the Greek MSS., and notably in the Sinaitic. The more probable account of the matter is, that the author, understanding some connection between Siloah and the word signifying to send, fancied a mystic allusion to the mission of Jesus Christ; and this will agree very well with the mode of thought of an Alexandrian Jew of the second century, but neither with the plainness nor the practical information of an apostle in the first. Geographical errors to be met with in the Gospel are the placing of a Bethany on the other side of Jordan (i. 28); for Bethany is undoubtedly the true reading, and not, as in the received text, Bethabara. The substitution of Bethabara was due to Origen, *ex exigentiâ loci*; for he acknowledged the reading of the MSS. to be Bethany, which is that also of the Sinaitic MS. Again, we read (iii. 23) that John baptized "in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there." It is at least doubtful whether there were such a place as Salim (Σαλειμ) on the banks of the Jordan, although it was supposed by Jerome this was the Salem of which Melchizedek was king (Gen. xiv. 18); but of Ænon there is no trace. And it is evident enough the composer of the Gospel must have mistaken in some document which he had before him עֵינַן "fountains," for the name of a place. So the substitution of the noun Sychar for Sichem (iv. 5—7), would be unaccountable in one who was really acquainted with the localities; and the vagueness of the whole narrative of the woman of Samaria at the well is inconsistent with the supposition of its having proceeded from an eye-witness. The well is said to be near to Sychar, to be Jacob's well, but the woman is said to come out of Samaria (ἐρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας, ver. 7), and there is a confusion throughout be-

tween the country of Samaria and the city of Samaria, and between the city of Samaria and the city or town of Sychar. It is sometimes said that *γυνή ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας* is equivalent to *γυνή Σαμαρεῖτις*, a woman of the province of Samaria; but this is excluded both by the formula, *ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ*, which might be said with reference to the city, but could not be said with reference to the province, as well as by the consideration that the whole transaction as related took place in the region of Samaria. And so throughout this Gospel, there is either no background to the events described, or the lines of place and circumstance are blurred. Particulars surrounding remarkable transactions may be expected to become faint in tradition—not so when reported by agents and eye-witnesses. An eye-witness deposing to an important fact, who gives us no hold upon him, or means of checking him, by recounting its accessories, is necessarily regarded with suspicion.

A celebrated argument for the truth of the New Testament history is known by the name of "undesigned coincidences." Arguments for our present purpose may be founded upon "undesigned omissions," "designed omissions," and "undesigned contradictions." By "undesigned omissions," we mean such as the omission in the third Gospel of all particulars concerning the widow of Nain and her son; and in the fourth Gospel, the omission of all particulars concerning the persons engaged at the wedding in Cana of Galilee. Now the inference from such an omission is very different in the two cases: in the former case, it is merely, that the compiler found no more in the tradition than that which he has handed on, and he only professes to write from tradition. In the latter case, we conclude that if the author had been an eye-witness, he must have known more; and if he had known more, it is inconceivable nothing more should have transpired: that he related nothing more is thus a strong proof that he was at least no eye-witness. The instances also of "designed omissions" to be met with in the fourth Gospel have a bearing on our present inquiry. The other Gospels were, substantially, extant, on any hypothesis, when the fourth Gospel was composed. It is therefore a designed omission to have left out all narrative of the incarnation, infancy and temptation of Jesus Christ. We say nothing now of the truth or credibility of those events.

But at any rate, John the apostle was a leading person, a "pillar-apostle," in the society wherein these stories are known to have been current at an early period ; he was one of those among whom such supernatural circumstances would be esteemed especially characteristic of the Messiahship of their Lord. Consequently, while we can very well understand the entire omission of those narratives in the fourth Gospel, if John were not its author, and consistently with a theology according to which a miraculous generation of Christ's humanity would add nothing to his dignity, it would be altogether inconceivable for the apostle not only not to have followed the recitals of the first and third Gospels in those particulars, but to have omitted all allusion to things of so great importance and so thoroughly believed by the other disciples. In reality these designed omissions are tacit protests of the strongest kind against the Christology of the Synoptics. The Christ of John could not "increase in wisdom," nor would it be fitting that he should receive baptism, nor could he be tempted of Satan ; nor, again, could he suffer an agony, or utter the cry, *Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*.

Of undesigned errors or contradictions, a remarkable one is found in the words put into the mouths of the Pharisees addressing Nicodemus (vii. 52), "Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet," or, strictly rendered, "no prophet hath arisen" (*ἐγὼ γέγραυ*): it is not supposable the Pharisees should have been ignorant that Jonah and Nahum were of the region afterwards called Galilee ; and this inconsistency is not removed by reading conjecturally *ἐγὼ γέγραυ*, for that indefinite tense, while it would include the future, would not exclude the past. Again, the statement (xi. 49—51) that Caiaphas foretold the propitiatory death of Christ, by reason of his having the gift of prophecy in virtue of his high-priesthood that year ; wherein is to be observed the inconsistency of such a man as Caiaphas being made the instrument of revealing a doctrine which had not as yet been declared even by Christ himself ; next, the groundless opinion that the Jewish high priest for the year was endowed with the gift of prophecy ; thirdly, the unhistorical representation that the high-priesthood was at that time an annual office, for Caiaphas, it appears from Josephus, held it for a period of ten years in succession (25—36).

This inaccuracy, to use the mildest term, is the more noticeable because "the other disciple," as the author of the Gospel describes himself, is stated to have been known unto the high priest,—an averment which also strikes us with surprise if John were, as the other evangelists represent, originally a fisherman on the coast of the Galilean Sea. There are other contradictions which cannot be held to be undesigned, such as the contradiction to Luke iii. 19—22, in the statement that John was not yet cast into prison (iii. 24); and above all, in the irreconcilable difference as to the last supper. Without determining anything as to the truth of the several narratives in this respect, it is plain enough that, according to the earlier current tradition, Jesus ate the Passover on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan and was crucified on the fifteenth; and that it must have been of set purpose he is represented in the fourth Gospel as eating his last supper—not being the Passover—on the thirteenth, and was crucified on the fourteenth. If the former tradition was really derived from the apostles, it is hardly supposable an apostle would have set himself to contradict it. But it is very supposable a later writer, desirous for dogmatic reasons of supplanting the older tradition, would assume the character of an apostle. He would naturally do so not too prominently, and he would leave the view which he desired to inculcate concerning the sacrifice of Christ as the true Paschal Lamb, to be inferred from his account of the Passion, rather than put it forth in a direct controversial manner. He might even do so in a sincere endeavour to reconcile the demands of truth and of charity, as he understood and felt them. Even in the face of the earlier tradition, he might consider it undoubtedly true that Christ did not celebrate a Passover at his last supper, because to his mind it was impossible he should have done so; but he would avoid directly impugning the authority of "memoirs" which represented that he did. Meanwhile he would not feel that he was infringing any rule of morality by personating with these objects the apostle John; nor in so doing would he at all shrink from clothing him with a character altogether different from that in which he appears in the older traditions. It was necessary for the author of the fourth Gospel to rest his doctrine on an apostolic authority superior, if possible, to that of Peter or of Paul. And so John becomes with him the dis-

ciple who leaned on Jesus' breast, and who drew more immediately than any other from the fountain itself of life and truth.

By those, indeed, who maintain the Johannean authorship of the Gospel, and by whom the intimations of authorship in the Gospel itself are considered to be conclusive, the suppression of the name of John is alleged to be due to the modesty of the apostle. It is not easy to understand how the apostle, if he wrote the Gospel, could suppress his name with a real desire for concealment, which would tend to defeat the very object of his writing; but if he did not intend to conceal himself—if he foresaw that his authorship would be perceived beneath the veil of the "disciple whom Jesus loved"—it would argue anything rather than modesty that he should have so described himself. It would have been more modest simply to have called himself John. It is, indeed, singular how little the character of modesty agrees, on the one hand, with what is elsewhere related of the two sons of Zebedee; and, on the other, how inconsistent is this semblance of retirement with the asseveration that he "saw these things," that "his record is true," that "he wrote these things, and his testimony is true" (xix. 35; xxi. 24). Had John simply written with his name, no further confirmation of his word would have been requisite. So little do these assertions give evidence on examination of being the utterances of the apostle himself, while they agree entirely with the supposition of some unknown person in a subsequent generation having personated the apostle in order to recommend his own work. It is very true the apostle is not named, nor pointed out by any mark peculiar or appropriate to him according to the other Gospels. But there is no other apostle to whom such a high place in the favour of Jesus could by any possibility be assigned. And as soon as the Gospel appears, it is known by the name of John; that is to say, as soon as it appears, there was no doubt as to the person intended to be designated as the author. The tradition which attributes the Gospel to St. John is inadequate to prove its genuineness, because it is counterbalanced by greatly preponderating evidence, internal and external on the other side, and because it does not reach back far enough to the time, or towards the time, when the apostle was alive; but its uniformity from the

period when the Gospel appeared proves the success of the literary artifice.* The implied assertion of Johannean authorship contained in the Gospel itself is, however, made to counterbalance external evidences and internal proofs of the opposite conclusion, mainly or exclusively by an argument of invidiousness and an argument of terror. It is an argument of invidiousness to allege, that to suppose the Gospel to be pseudonymous is to accuse one of the most highly gifted of Christian men of being a liar and an impostor; it is an argument of terror, that thus all historical certitude is undermined, and all reliance upon the records of preceding ages must be given up.

On the subject of pseudonymous literature, and by way of reply to the argument of invidiousness, we may cite the following remarks, quoted with approval by a thoroughly orthodox divine of the last generation, Professor Laurence, afterwards Archbishop of Cashel, from a dissertation upon the Second Book of Esdras, by Dr. Francis Lee (1752):

"You know nothing was anciently more common, or held more innocent, than such personations of authors. And if this, in succeeding ages, came to be the occasion of some mistakes, especially among the vulgar and less critical readers, it is not much to be wondered at; but it is not then to be imputed as a crime to them, who had no thoughts of deceiving any by it, or (which is all one) of whom it doth not appear that they had. Some of the first pieces of antiquity, you know, have been written in this character; the ancient Academy were particularly famous for it. We do not think the worse of Plato for his personating of Socrates, or of Cicero for his personating of Cato. And though the names of Plato and Cicero should have been swept away with the torrent of time, yet not only the book of Wisdom, but that of Job also, is supposed by some learned men to be of this kind, without derogating from the authority of one or the excellence of both. The works of these excellent masters, whereby they have given a sort of eternity to those two great men, would not have been for that the less valuable, notwithstanding all that some critics have urged to shew them to be supposititious."†

* Chap. xxi. may have been added to the Gospel, as is generally supposed, by a second hand, which would not affect the probabilities as they are stated above. It is, in any case, only an echo of what has preceded; or perhaps we are presented in ver. 24 with the earliest extant proof of the rapid success of the literary artifice.

† Ascensio Isaiæ Vatis—*a* Ricardo Laurence, Heb. Ling. Prof. Reg., etc. etc., Oxon. 1819, p. 178.

We cannot see any sufficient reason, while the fact of this pseudonymous literature is acknowledged among Greek, Latin and Jewish authors, and while examples of it are to be met with at least in the Apocryphal writings of the pre-Christian and Christian periods, why it is forbidden us to conclude some of the books of the New Testament itself to be pseudonymous also. According to certain theories of inspiration and of a supernatural determination of the Canon, it might possibly be inadmissible to suppose the author of one of those books to have assumed a character or a name which was not his own. But such inferences from mere theories ought to be no bar to a critical inquiry. It should be borne in mind that none of the authors of the books of the New Testament placed their own works in the list which was afterwards known as the Canon. Nor, as far as we have any means of judging, could the author of the fourth Gospel foresee that his book would be reckoned among the specially sacred Christian writings for ages to come, any more than the authors of the Apocalypse and of the Epistle to the Hebrews could foretell that theirs, after fluctuations of opinion, would ultimately be generally received into the Canon—or than the authors of the Epistle of Barnabas and of the Pastor of Hermas, that, after a similar fluctuation of opinion, theirs would finally be left out. It is futile to inquire whether, if he could have foreseen such a result, he would have felt it justifiable to assume the character of the apostle. We may, however, feel very sure that the writing would have secured by its own merits a permanent place among the primitive Christian Scriptures, and that a name would have been given to it, if any name were needed, as a stamp of its authority.

As to the argument from terror, which seeks to deter from the investigation of the truth concerning Biblical histories through fear of consequences, it may suffice, that they who make discoveries, if they be discoveries, or who declare truth, if what they declare is truth, are not responsible for consequences: consequences are in higher hands than theirs. He who has constituted the universal order will undoubtedly in the end justify his own appointment.

But let us submit to be uncertain and doubtful as to the histories of the past, and as to the form and features of the mighty ones whom we are prone even to fall down unto

and worship. It may be, some ancients of the human race, now seeming vast and superhuman in the dim distance, whose lineaments we would anxiously reproduce according to our own ideal, were in their own day ill-proportioned and grotesque, living in ages when neither individuals nor societies had distinct consciousness of themselves, their aims or ends, and such could supply no proper models for us. It may be, again, of necessity, as the ever-shifting panorama of events moves on, its earlier scenes must fade and become indistinct, while the present grows in vividness and intensity, teaching us that we must cohere with the past, but not live in it. Or, finally, it may be this—the kingdom of God cometh not with observation: things spiritual and agencies and persons spiritual do not define themselves so readily and clearly to our sublunary eyesight as things and persons sensual and earthly. We should not, therefore, think it hard or strange, to know Cæsar better from the Commentaries, than we can possibly know Christ, outwardly at least, from the Gospels. When the Roman falls, empires are shaken: only in an after-growth of legend, when one greater than Cæsar gives up the ghost, are the rocks rent and the day darkened—for the kingdom of God cometh not with observation. And these “last words” are intelligible or unintelligible, not by reason of any merit or demerit in historians, but because they issue from a higher or a lower nature. The “*Et tu Brute,*” we can easily understand, a schoolboy can interpret it: we can give a shrewd guess at the irony, not untinged with religion, of, “I owe a cock to *Æsculapius* ;” but, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” we yearn and weep over in vain. Meanwhile let it suffice us if the work of Christ abide. Let us be thankful to behold therein the best evidences of his presence, the only traces of his footsteps we may ever recover. For if we go forth to seek him in the body, he is gone. Men say, indeed, Lo! he is here, or, He is there; but we do not find him—not in Matthew, nor in Mark, nor in Luke, nor yet in John.

Something more will have to be said of the genesis of the fourth Gospel.

S. T. B.

VII.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE two volumes of Mr. Donaldson's "Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine,"* in which he treats of the Apologists, are marked by the same qualities of lucid and exact statement and rigid theological impartiality as distinguished the first part of his work. It is pleasant to travel over a region so strewn with wrecks of past debate in company with a guide who has no theory to support, and whose only object is to observe and note down the natural characteristics of the route. As a history of Christian *literature*, Mr. Donaldson's work leaves little to be desired. His plan is to take up one by one the books which have come down to us from the age of which he treats; to discuss their authorship and genuineness; to give an abstract of their contents; to describe minutely and exhaustively their theological peculiarities; and, in the last place, to enumerate the extant MSS. and various editions. When, as in the case of the Apologists, a number of books are capable of being arranged in a well-defined group, he prefixes an introduction, in which he attempts to seize and describe their general character. In the performance of this task, his style, which is clear without possessing any special force or elegance, does him good service; a more rhetorical presentation of his matter might produce upon the reader's mind the impression that he was listening, not to the decision of a judge, but to the pleading of an advocate. But the work answers less completely to its title as a History of Christian Doctrine. It is rather a compendious and methodical collection of the materials of which such a history must be built up. When we compare it with the *Dogmengeschichten*, of which the theological literature of Germany supplies more than one example, we feel the want of a more continuous treatment.

The task which the historian of Christian doctrine in the three first centuries has to perform, greatly resembles that of the paleontologist, who from a few scattered bones and leaves endeavours to reconstruct the whole flora and fauna

* A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council. By James Donaldson, M.A. Vols. II. III. The Apologists. London: Macmillan. 1866.

of an extinct era. So of the literature of the period on which Mr. Donaldson labours we have no more than a few fossil remains—a letter, an apology, a controversial tract. We find prevailing in each of these a certain type of Christian thought and belief, but the links between them must be supplied by the historian's own insight, and he can never be sure that his conjectural connection of ideas possesses a greater certainty than attaches to the possible. But this genesis and growth of ideas are precisely what the peculiarities of Mr. Donaldson's plan prevent him from setting before us; he analyzes with extreme care the doctrinal contents of the Shepherd, and tells us what Clement of Rome seems to have believed, and ascertains the theological position of Justin; but he has nothing to say of the relation in which these stand to one another, or of the common root in Scripture of their varying Christian faith. Nor, indeed, will this necessary task ever be performed except by a critical historian who is bold enough to go a step further than Mr. Donaldson, and to begin his work with the canonical books of the New Testament. Every day makes it more clear that the line which separates these from the works of what are called the Apostolical Fathers, is one artificially drawn by theological prejudice. While, on the one hand, the Alexandrine and Sinaitic MSS. reveal a condition of Christian opinion in which the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas were thought worthy to stand side by side with the Canonical Scriptures, it is, on the other, a conclusion not warranted by the facts of the case, that all the books of the New Testament were prior in time of composition to all of those which are universally allowed to rank next to them in antiquity. But even were this the case—even did we admit that the Gospel of John, for instance, has been proved to belong to the first Christian century—it would not the less be true that the peculiarities of faith and feeling to be noted in the Apostolical Fathers stand in a necessary connection with the events and modes of thought which the New-Testament Scriptures profess to record, and except in direct relation to them can neither be understood nor accounted for. Mr. Donaldson avoids, no doubt, a dangerous rock of theological hatred by excluding the New Testament from the scope of his work; but at the same time he seriously impairs its philosophical value.

From the first letter which Paul wrote down to the latest German commentary upon it, Christian literature is a whole; and the same method of critical and historical treatment is applicable to every part.

One important service to theology Mr. Donaldson's book, from its rigid, almost dry, impartiality is admirably fitted to perform. Certain heterodox theologians, in England and elsewhere, are wont to allege that only the germs of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity are to be found in Scripture, and that their development into their present shape is due to various forces, not all of Christian origin. With the first part of this statement Roman Catholic divines agree, though they go on to state that the development, the reality of which they admit, was the work of the Holy Spirit operating in and through the infallible Church. The ordinary Protestant, again, unwilling to assent to the theory of a natural, still less willing to submit to the allegation of an infallible development, is shut up to a position less tenable than either of the other two, namely, that the Nicene doctrine is, after all, to be found in Scripture by those who look for it rightly. We commend to him Mr. Donaldson's account of the theology of the Apostolical Fathers and the Apologists, and beg him to account for the fact, that the nearer men lived to the times of the apostles, the less definite and complete were their ideas of the central doctrine of Nicene Christianity. From the Rationalist as from the Roman Catholic point of view, the history of Christian opinion in the three first centuries is at least intelligible; to the evangelical Protestant, who accepts the creeds of the Church without acknowledging her authority, we cannot conceive how it should be other than "a maze without a plan."

The author of "The Papal Drama"* says in his Preface: "I do not profess to write the history of the Roman Church; I do not profess to write a minute and detailed history of the Popes: but I do profess to tell with some fulness and comprehensiveness the story of the Poppedom; . . . to set it forth in its twofold character as a spiritual and a secular power, and to consider its relations to other powers, its place in history, and its part in the great drama of human affairs."

* *The Papal Drama: a Historical Essay.* By Thomas H. Gill, Author of the *Anniversaries*. London: Longmans, 1866.

That which Mr. Gill professes to do, he has done, and well done. His story of the Popedom is both interesting and trustworthy. No reader can doubt that with persevering labour and conscientious investigation he has striven "after strict accuracy in the statement of facts and perfect fairness in the estimate of character." As a virtual if not directly intended reply to defences of the Papacy of old times or new by Cardinals dead or living, it deserves the gratitude of every sincere Protestant. As a warning to half-hearted Protestants everywhere, it seems to us, perhaps because we do not need it, admirable. The need of it just now in England is great. With national lack of intellectual conscience or insular superabundance of sovereign self-will, an ever-increasing "Church" party spurns the Protestant name for itself, and scouts Protestant rights for all others; while presuming, with a coolness which would be insolent were it not ignorant, to exercise "private judgment" as to parts and parcels of the indivisible Catholic dogma, and individual preference as to ritual, whose basis is authority; and thus makes itself, in fact, by virtue of near resemblance, the worst heretic and rebel from the one infallible Church. We must hope that some at least of those who have set their faces Romewards may learn from this book the lesson which it is so well able to teach; what a return to Rome really means; what a rejection of the Protestant name logically involves; what a preference for Catholic over Reformed principles justly carries with it. This defence and this warning Mr. Gill's work supplies, setting forth with eloquent earnestness the fruits of extensive and careful reading. That it supplies, moreover, weapons of offence, sharp and heavy, for all future polemic against the Papacy, such as will be within the grasp and strength of future Stowells or M'Neiles, and may well become a pebbly bottom whence small Recordite Davids shall pick up sling-stones to pepper the Roman Goliath from a safe distance, is an unfortunate result of its merits and its faults. For Mr. Gill has not written a history. He says, "I lay no claim to the impartiality of religious indifference." We do not for a moment admit that historic impartiality presupposes religious indifference. In the light, however, of this avowal, interpreted by the work itself, our author must be read. The "Papal Drama" is not a history. If it were, we might be forced to call it a prejudiced history;

a one-sided history ; a partial, puritanical, Protestant history. It is an accusation : the accusation of an honourable enemy ; of a public prosecutor, the more pitiless because not retained for fee or reward ; moved only, his conscience tells him, by love of truth and sense of duty. The work must, therefore, be read in the light of his assertion in the Preface : "Every earnest believer in Christianity as the full and final revelation of God, must look upon the Popedom either as the perfection or as the nethermost degradation thereof." The style rings with a pure and perfect hatred, natural to Reformers and hereditary in genuine Puritans, reminding one in a way that is good to be reminded—for who knows what is coming?—of the feelings of earnest Protestants in the 16th and 17th centuries, warming one's heart now and then with Cromwellian or Miltonic tones. But history it is not. Perhaps "Drama," too, is not quite appropriate as title. Fitter, it seems to us, would have been—seeing what we now see of the end—to adopt Dante's name, "Comedy," with a contradictory epithet! "A Puritan poet," to parody a *mot* of Voltaire's, "is not obliged to write like Thucydides." A writer in the 19th century is not bound to imbibe this century's critical spirit—if he can help it. A student and scholar of to-day is not forced to believe that there is such a science as philosophy of history, though perhaps no intellectual distinction of our age will hereafter be reckoned so great as this, that the 19th century first saw philosophical history arise in idea and realize itself in part. Still, in forming a judgment upon so great a drama as the Papacy's, in deciding the value of a world-historical fact of a dozen ages' standing, one consideration should not be left out of sight which lies somewhere among the roots of philosophical history, but lays no claim to be of the fruits thereof. *Could* a phenomenon which for so many ages accompanied the progress of Christianity, evidently in certain ways aiding that progress, and so long held almost undoubted sway over nations, helping to mould their life and growth, have been altogether bad? "Whatever is, is right," when taken as motto for present conduct, shews its upholder to be either ignorant that in every actual state of the world Satan rules as well as God, or to be in conscious alliance with the former. But to deny that whatever *has been*, must be in some sense good

and right, seems equivalent to asserting that at some one period of the world's history—say from the 6th to the 16th centuries of the Christian era—Satan was, on the whole, victorious over the moral government of God.

If the reader can go beyond Sydney Smith's famous joke by not merely taking off his flesh and sitting in his bones, but also laying aside his skeleton,—and if, after that, he can drop his personality and think of himself as merely a centre of force, or as a particular mode of operation of the one great force which is everywhere active,—he will, we apprehend, be in the proper frame of mind to appreciate Mr. Charles Bray's essay on Force and its Mental Correlates.* The doctrine of this little book, laid down somewhat dogmatically, and illustrated with extracts from Carlyle, Emerson, Spinoza, J. S. Mill and Miss Martineau's Mr. Atkinson, is, that there are no such things as Matter or Spirit, but that both are resolvable into Force—that being heat in one form which is thought or feeling in another—that time and space are modes of thought—that all things, both the changes of the world and the actions of men, are bound together by an absolute necessity, which "is most probably established and maintained by the Will of the Creator"—and that consequently there can be no moral responsibility. Of course there is something to be said for this doctrine, and Mr. Bray says it on the whole very well. But the first return to natural feeling or active duty will generally dissipate such speculations; and the answer to such reasoning as is here presented to us, is to be found, we think, in the instinctive feelings and convictions of mankind. There are, indeed, many points in which a man resembles a steam-engine, as a table drawn up by Mr. Bray incontestably proves; but there are also some important differences. Probably the majority of readers will take more interest in the speculations on *spiritualism* than anything else in this volume. The writer appears to accept as genuine most of the alleged phenomena, including those of the famous *Cornhill* article; but accounts for them, not by the assumption of personal spirits acting independently of human agency, but by supposing that certain unconscious influences go forth from every human

* On Force and its Mental Correlates. By Charles Bray. London: Longmans. 1866.

brain, and constitute a kind of spirit atmosphere, by the reaction of which the phenomena are produced.

Dr. Beard has published a small volume, under the title of "A Memorial to the Memorial Hall,"* with the avowed intention of leaving on record a decided statement of the doctrinal views held by those who were most active in the erection of the handsome building raised in Manchester in honour of the Ejected Two Thousand of the year 1662. We think that Dr. Beard does not trust sufficiently to the power of free inquiry in thus trying to guard the open trust on which that Hall was most judiciously established from possible misapplication; but it is not necessary in this place to discuss the question of trusts for religious and philanthropical purposes. The author of this work has, in furtherance of his special object, published several discourses which he has delivered on the induction of his pupils to ministerial duty or in the regular course of his academical duties. The tone which reigns in these discourses, as in all Dr. Beard's publications, is a free recognition of the power of the Spirit which bloweth where it listeth, with a special and intense reverence for its peculiar and fuller manifestation in Jesus Christ and the Scriptures.

By a strange caprice of fortune, South Africa seems destined to furnish leading cases in all the difficulties that can arise either between different orders in the Church or between Church and State. During the past year, the Supreme Court of the Cape of Good Hope has been busy with an action brought by the Rev. Thomas François Burgers, minister of Hanover, against the Synodical Commission of the Dutch Reformed Church.† Mr. Burgers had been brought before the Commission on a charge of heresy; had been convicted of denying the personality of the Devil and the sinlessness of Christ; and in consequence had been suspended from his cure. Against this sentence he appealed to the Supreme Court of the colony, alleging, as the ground of his appeal, certain technical irregularities in the procedure of

* A Memorial to the Memorial Hall, Albert Square, Manchester, in its Union with the Unitarian Home-Missionary Board. By John R. Beard, D.D. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1866.

† In the Privy Council. The Case of the Rev. T. F. Burgers, Minister of the Dutch Reformed Church at Hanover, Cape of Good Hope, suspended for Heresy. London: Trübner. 1866.

his ecclesiastical judges. The chief interest of the trial centred not so much in the discussion of the merits of the case, as in a preliminary single combat between the Hon. William Porter, Attorney-General of the colony, and the Rev. Andrew Murray, Jun., who, as Moderator of the Synod, argued the case of his Church. The latter, with his advisers, had caused to be inserted among the pleadings a certain statement of principles—a very bold and able document, in which, both upon general and legal grounds, a complete independence of the State and its Courts was claimed for the Dutch Reformed Church. This statement, as technically informal, was struck out of the pleadings, and the ensuing argument turned upon the jurisdiction of the Court in such cases as that now brought before it. This jurisdiction was impugned with considerable ability by Mr. Murray; defended with great force of argument by Mr. Porter. It is almost needless to say that the Court maintained its own rights, and at a subsequent sitting unanimously decided that Mr. Burgers' suspension was null and void, condemning the plaintiffs in costs. As we are informed that an appeal to the Privy Council has been lodged by the Synod, we abstain from further detail as to the facts or arguments of the case. However it may finally be decided, it must be of the greatest importance to such bodies—e.g. the Wesleyan Methodists and the various bodies of Scotch Presbyterians—as claim a spiritual *imperium* within and independent of the State. In the mean time, a Church Defence Association has been formed at the Cape in Mr. Burgers' interest; while his friends in England, among whom we may mention Rev. H. B. Wilson, of Great Staughton, St. Neots, are anxious to receive further pecuniary help.

"The English Life of Jesus, Part II.,"* is the continuation of a pamphlet on the credibility of the Gospel narratives which we have previously noticed, and is a similar example of purely destructive criticism. The author finds fault with M. Renan, that, having pulled in pieces, he undertakes the task of putting together again, the Gospel narratives; and seems to think that even Strauss has gone too far in attempting to account, on the mythical theory, for the legends

* The English Life of Jesus, Part II.: comprising an Analysis of the Career of John the Baptist and of the Beginning of the Public Ministry of Jesus. Thomas Scott, Ramsgate.

to which he refuses his credence. We shall not now enter into any minute examination of the critique here attempted; this side of the question cannot be more ably or more strongly put than it has already been put by Strauss; and we are not unwilling that negative, as well as every other species of criticism, should have its full and free expression. We only desire to point out that the position, of refusing to undertake the process of reconstruction, which this author takes up, is really untenable by any philosophical critic. No success in proving the unhistorical character of the Gospels can argue Christianity out of existence; it is an effect which must have had a competent cause; and the discovery and definition of this cause is precisely what the philosophical historian has to do. Practically, every man does this for himself, and constructs a Christ in his own mind from what materials he can; probably even the author of this pamphlet, could we cross-question him, has some vague idea of the Founder of Christianity floating in his imagination, the result of that very process of rehabilitation which he here refuses to perform. Only when Christianity has ceased to exist will men be content with a purely negative criticism of the Gospels; but then we greatly doubt whether they will care for any criticism of them at all. So long as there is a Christianity, they will want a Christ, and will prefer even that strange compound of the prophet and the *petit-maitre* which M. Renan offers to them, to the absolute denials of this "English Life of Jesus."

"A Layman's Faith"* is one of the little books—so numerous and so peculiar as to be almost a sign of the times—in which men who, dissatisfied with existing forms of Christian doctrine as presented by the Church, have thought out a faith for themselves; give their lucubrations to the world, in full confidence that what is so satisfactory to themselves cannot be unsatisfactory to others. These tiny volumes, which aim to settle controversies which require in those who would approach them with any chance of success very special attainments, are often remarkable by their naïve ignorance. The present is no exception to the rule; its author does not even understand the difficulties of which he dis-

* A Layman's Faith, Doctrines and Liturgy. By a Layman. London: Trübner. 1866.

poses with such apparent ease.—So also with “A Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels,”* in which Mr. H. Grenville has bestowed a world of patient industry to accomplish an insoluble problem. What is to be said to a writer who, in face of the likenesses of the Synoptics, lays down as a main principle that the four Gospels are “*independent* accounts of the life and death of the Messiah,” it being plain that this, except in a very modified sense, is precisely what they are not? Or what may not be accomplished in the way of reconciliation by one who adopts Lord Arthur Hervey’s hypothesis respecting the genealogies of Christ, for which not a *scintilla* of evidence can be alleged?

The Rev. Arthur Wolfe is the author of a little volume entitled, “Family Prayers and Scripture Calendar,”† which we can strongly recommend as characterized by a pure and unaffected devotion. It may be taken as a proof that true worshipers are often not so far divided even in the act of worship as they are wont to imagine, that the alteration of a very few phrases would render these prayers fit for general use. And in piety that which is most universal is really highest too.—We had not the opportunity of noticing at the time of its first publication the translation of Dr. Réville’s admirable biographical sketch of Theodore Parker.‡ It is well fitted for, and will we hope obtain, a wide circulation, as a faithful portrait of a noble and deeply devout man, the quality of whose manliness is daily receiving a wider recognition, as the noise of the controversies which raged about him in his lifetime gradually dies away.

Since our last issue, Mr. Wicksteed, Mr. Hincks and Mr. Thom, have each contributed a sermon to the present controversy among the Unitarian churches. The former, who was the official mouthpiece of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association at its recent annual meeting, has now published the striking sermon which he preached on that

* A Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels, designed to shew that on a minute Critical Analysis the Writings of the Four Evangelists contain no Contradictions within themselves. By H. Grenville. London: J. R. Smith. 1866.

† Family Prayers and Scripture Calendar. By Rev. Arthur Wolfe, M.A., Rector of Fornham All Saints, and of Westley, Bury St. Edmunds, &c. &c. London: Bell and Daldy. 1865.

‡ The Life and Writings of Theodore Parker. By Albert Réville, D.D. Authorized Translation, revised by the Author. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1865.

occasion with such marked effect.* We will venture upon only a single remark ;—that the frequently expressed dissent from Mr. Wicksteed's definition of Unitarianism as equivalent to Monotheism,† may serve as a reminder that phrases can, after all, be used to good practical purpose only in their generally accepted sense ; and that questions which turn on the signification of a word must be decided, not by what it can be made to mean, but by what, in common parlance, it actually does mean.—Mr. Hincks' sermon,‡ designed to inform his congregation of the aims and principles involved in the recent movement, deserves, and we hope will receive, a wide circulation, as a clear and calm statement which, even when it fails to convince, will rouse no anger and shock no prejudice.—Mr. Thom's eloquent discourse, "The Church of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, one Fold and one Shepherd,"§ contains parts of a sermon preached before the Association in 1850. It is an earnest and moving appeal on behalf of Christianity as a trust in and communion with the Divine Persons of God and Christ, and forcibly points out how on this basis a church inclusive of all sects might be founded.—A pamphlet, called "Truth and Opinion: a Letter to John Eliot Howard, Esq.,"|| while referring to controversies among the much divided body of Plymouth Brethren, with which we are little acquainted, is curious as making copious reference, in its pleading for a larger liberty, to the present Unitarian debates, and especially to Mr. Martineau's article reprinted from our pages.

"The Life and the Light"¶ is a long and eloquent sermon, preached on behalf of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, by the Rev. H. Allon, who is well known as an Independent

* *The One God and Father of All: a Sermon, &c.* By Charles Wicksteed, B.A. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1866.

† P. 12.

‡ *The New Catholic Movement: a Sermon, &c.* By Thomas Hincks, B.A. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1866.

§ *The Church of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus, one Fold and one Shepherd: a Discourse, &c.* By John Hamilton Thom. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1866.

|| *Truth and Opinion: a Letter to John Eliot Howard, Esq., on Church Discipline and Christian Charity in their Relations to supposed Error.* London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1866.

¶ *The Life and the Light: a Sermon, &c.* By Rev. Henry Allon. London: Jackson, Walford and Hodder. 1866.

minister. It powerfully presents the general truth that the gospel is its own best evidence, though we cannot follow Mr. Allon when he carries this principle into doctrinal detail, and says, "The salvation that is in Christ respects, on the one hand, every requirement of the Divine Government; it satisfies, on the other, every requirement of my own moral nature."*—"Two Sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge,"† by Canon Carus of Winchester, entitled respectively "Jesus Christ witnessing to the Truth," and "The Holy Spirit guiding into all Truth," shew in a singular way how little the scientific spirit which is supposed to animate the studies of Cambridge has penetrated into the domain of theology. They are moderate in tone, but with the premisses which Canon Carus quietly assumes it would be possible to prove anything.

In the "Addresses on the First Celebration of a Confirmation Service in the High-Pavement Chapel, Nottingham,"‡ by Mr. Tayler and Mr. Clayden, we have a valuable memorial of what must have been an occasion of singular interest.—Mr. Calloway's funeral sermon for Mr. Brodhurst, of Newark,§ is a warm tribute to the memory of one who, at considerable cost, not altogether of the pecuniary sort, gave a clear and steadfast testimony to what he believed to be Christian truth.—"The Religious Value of the Doctrine of Continuity,"|| a sermon by Mr. Clayden, is an eloquent application of the leading idea of Mr. Groves' address at Nottingham to religious truths and hopes.—In a pamphlet entitled "Unitarians vindicated against Misrepresentations,"¶ Mr. Maginnis gives a courteous but emphatic and spirited reply to the Rev. C. H. Crawford, who, though a benefited

* P. 37.

† Two Sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge, &c. By William Carus, M.A., Canon of Winchester; formerly Senior Fellow and Senior Dean of Trinity College. Published by request. London: Bell and Daldy. 1866.

‡ Addresses on the First Celebration of a Confirmation Service, &c. By Rev. P. W. Clayden and Rev. J. J. Tayler, B.A., &c. London: Whitfield, Green and Son.

§ The True Foundation of the Hope of Heaven: a Sermon, &c. By Rev. Henry Calloway. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1866.

|| The Religious Value of the Doctrine of Continuity: a Sermon. By P. W. Clayden. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1866.

¶ Unitarians vindicated against Misrepresentations of the Rev. C. H. Crawford, Rector of Old Swinford: a Letter. By David Maginnis. London: Whitfield, Green and Son. 1866.

clergyman, shews himself in a recently published volume of sermons to be a coarse and vulgar controversialist.

Of the miscellaneous pamphlets which have reached us, we may mention two. The first contains two prize essays on Vivisection,* published by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals; both of which agree in reprobating the cruel and useless practice which obtains in France, of teaching veterinary students by surgical practice upon the living subject; while the second and more scientific of the two (by Dr. Markham) defends vivisection in certain cases, as the only means of ascertaining important physiological truth. The question really goes deeper than either essayist has followed it, and could be satisfactorily decided only upon the basis of a general theory of the moral relation of man to the lower animals.—“University Education in Ireland”† is practically a continuation by Professor Cairnes of the article on that subject which appeared in the first number of our present volume, and which was reprinted for general circulation. He now, in a Letter addressed to Mr. J. S. Mill, defends the position which he then occupied, against the attack of Professor Sullivan, who, as might naturally be expected, raises the cry of illiberality against those who hesitate to introduce the denominational principle into university education. Mr. Cairnes’ pamphlet is temperate and able; but its force is neutralized by the announcement in the Postscript that the new charter has actually been signed. We fully share both Mr. Cairnes’ regret that this should have been done, and his indignation at the deceit which has been practised upon the opponents of the measure.

E

* Vivisection, is it Necessary or Justifiable? Two Prize Essays, &c. London: Hardwicke. 1866.

† University Education in Ireland: a Letter to J. S. Mill, Esq., M.P. By J. E. Cairnes, M.A. London: Macmillan. 1866.

INDEX TO VOL. III.

- ADYE, W. F., "Lecture on the History of the Printed Text of the N. T.," 464.
Ainalie, R., "Discourses delivered at Brighton," noticed, 460.
Allon, Henry, "The Life and the Light," noticed, 597.
- BARTON, John, M.A., "The Reality, but not the Duration, of Future Punishment is revealed," noticed, 315.
Beard, J. R., D.D., "A Revised English Bible the Want of the Church and the Demand of the Age," reviewed, 188. "Letters to the Unitarians of England," 462. "A Memorial to the Memorial Hall," noticed, 593.
BEARD, CHARLES, B.A., author of article, "English Religion and English Philanthropy," 342. Of article, "Characteristics of Roman Catholic Piety," 501.
BIBLE SOCIETY, BRITISH AND FOREIGN, 486. Origin and growth of the Society, 486. Its Dissenting elements, 486. Its prosperous progress, 487. Opposition of Dr. Herbert Marsh in 1811, 488. Opposition to the Preface to German edition, 488. Apocrypha controversy, 489. Alienation of enlightened continental Romanists, 493. "Trinitarian" Bible Society, 493. Protest against the Society's Latin versions, 494. Firm attitude of the Society, 495. Absence of "High" and "Broad" Churchmen, 496. Quality of the speeches at its annual meetings, 497. Remissness of the Society in not securing the best Text, 499. Inferiority of its agents, 499. Self-laudation and bad taste of its Reports, 500.
BOWRING, SIR JOHN, LL.D., author of article, "W. J. Fox," 413.
Bray, Charles, "Force and its Mental Correlates," noticed, 592.
Brooke, Stopford A., M.A., "Life and Letters of the Rev. F. W. Robertson, M.A.," reviewed, 21.
Burgers, Rev. T. F., "Case in the Privy Council," noticed, 593.
Bushnell, Horace, D.D., "The Vicarious Sacrifice," noticed, 310.
- CAIRNES, J. E., M.A., author of article, "University Education in Ireland," 116. "University Education in Ireland," noticed, 599.
Calloway, Henry, "The True Foundation of the Hope of Heaven," noticed, 598.
Carns, William, M.A., "Two Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge," noticed, 598.
- CHARITIES OF EUROPE, 49. The Rauhe Haus at Horn, 50. A house of refuge for children, founded by Dr. Wichern in 1833, 51. The family system, 52. The Brethren of the Rauhe Haus, 54. The Inner Mission of the German Evangelical Church, 55. Excessive religious organization at the Rauhe Haus, 56. Father Zeller's school at Beuggen, 57. Bräm's Society at Neukirchen for adoption of children, 61. The Netherland Mettray at Rijsselt, 63. Greater theological liberality at Rijsselt, 66. Girls' asylum at Laforce, 70. No Catholic charities visited by Mr. De Liefde, 72.

- CHURCH. THE LIVING CHURCH THROUGH CHANGING CREEDS**, 296. Terms of acceptance with God the true conditions of Church union, 296. This the principle of the early Nonconformists, 297. Baxter, Tallents, Calamy, Lowman, Dr. John Taylor, 298, 299. Unitarian movement, 300. Encroaching on Presbyterian institutions, 301. Foundation of British and Foreign Unitarian Association, 302. Cannot truly represent the older congregations, 302. Compelled inaction in 1834, 303. Necessity of a wider organization, 304. Opinion of Mr. Edgar Taylor, 304. Practical scheme proposed, 306. Reprint of this paper, 462.
- Clayden, P. W., "Confirmation Address at Nottingham," noticed, 598. "The Religious Value of the Doctrine of Continuity," noticed, 598.
- COBBE, FRANCES POWER, author of article, "Robertson's Life and Letters," 21. Of article, "The Religion of Childhood," 317.
- Coupland, W. C. B.A., B.Sc., "Shall we not go Forward?" noticed, 158. "Incentives to the Higher Life," noticed, 461.
- Cox, Robert, F.S.A., "The Literature of the Sabbath Question," noticed, 150.
- "Credibility of the Gospel Narratives of the Birth and Infancy of Christ," noticed, 814.
- CROSSKEY, H. W., author of article, "The Theological Position in Scotland," 362.
- DALE, R. W., M.A., "Discourses delivered on Special Occasions," noticed, 313.
- Davidson, Samuel, D.D., "The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, revised from Critical Sources," reviewed, 188.
- Davis, Thomas, M.A., "Endless Sufferings not the Doctrine of Scripture," noticed, 459.
- Desprez, Philip S., B.D., "Daniel, or the Apocalypse of the Old Testament," noticed, 309.
- "Devotions for Holy Communion, taken from the Paradise for the Christian Soul," reviewed, 227.
- Donaldson, James, M.A., "Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine," Vols. II., III., noticed, 587.
- Drummond, James, B.A., "The Kingdom that cometh not with Observation," noticed, 462.
- DRUMMOND, ROBERT B., B.A., author of article, "History of the Jewish Church," 73. Of article, "'Son of God' considered as a Title of the Messiah," 465.
- Durandus, William, "The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments," reviewed, 227.
- "ECCLES HOMO. A SURVEY OF THE LIFE AND WORK OF JESUS CHRIST," 161. Difficulty of determining the religious value of the book, 161. Method not critical, 162. Image of Christ gathered out of particulars by a spiritual law of selection, 163. Great religious discernment of the book, 164. Shews the possibility of a kingdom of God on the basis of the human personality of Christ, 165. Christ as Caller, Legislator, Judge of Men, 166. Supernatural credentials, 167. Faith the test of admission into the kingdom, 169. Baptism and the Lord's Supper external tests, 170. Christ the man in whom were shewn the true relations of God to the human spirit, 172. Christianity contrasted with Law and with Philosophy, 178. Interpretation of the "woman taken in adultery," 174. So-called legislation of Christ, 176. The enthusiasm of humanity, 178. Christ's assumption of authority and its results, 185. Catholicity of the true kingdom—a church of the Holy Spirit, 186.
- EDUCATION (FEMALE) IN THE MIDDLE CLASSES**, 526. The education of women forces on that of men, 527. Wifehood and Motherhood the true destiny

- of woman, 528. Vast educational power of the mother, 529. Ruskin's "Lilies," 529. Hints for the physical education of women, 530. Management of the home, 531. Intellectual education of women, 532. Excessive use of mere memory, 533. Real education begins after the school training ends, 534. Tennyson's "Princess," 534. The mind makes the usefulness, 535. Moral education of women, 536. Impossibility of teaching morality, 536. Urgent necessity for a healthy moral training, 537. Teutonic reverence for women, 539. How and when well deserved, 540.
- ENGLISH RELIGION AND ENGLISH PHILANTHROPY**, 342. Modern diffusion of philanthropic feeling, 342. Recognition of its religious basis, 343. Denominationalism of English Christianity, 344. Is the cause of separate action in matters of religion, 345. Interference with the domain of philanthropy, 346. Reflex action of philanthropy on religion, 346. Shall the sectarian spirit be suffered still further to invade the realm of benevolence? 348. Are congregations to be the centres of philanthropic as well as religious activity? 349. Evil effects of this method of action, 350. A church should send its members out into the world ready for benevolent action, 351. Application of these principles to primary education, 352. English education a compromise, 352. Working of the system in a country parish, 354. Conscience clause, 355. The case of large towns, 357. The Manchester Education Aid Society and its revelations, 357. Inefficiency and injustice of the present system, 359. Advantage of the parochial system of the Church of England, 360. Repetition of principle pleaded for, 362.
- ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE AND THE NECESSITY FOR A NEW ONE**, 188. Importance of the subject, 188. Accumulation of critical materials since the publication of the Authorized Version, 189. Instances in which the A. V. has been made from an incorrect text, 191. Mistakes in the A. V. itself, 192. New translations: Purver's, 195. Macrae's, Geddes', 196. Boothroyd's, 197. Humsey's, 198. Wellbeloved, Smith and Porter's, 198. Benisch's, 199. R. Young's, 199. Sharpe's, Leese's, 200. Desirableness of a new version, 201. Testimonies in favour of the scheme, 203. Rules to be observed in making a new version, 206.
- "English Life of Jesus, Part II.," noticed, 594.
- "Eternal Gospel," the, noticed, 464.
- Ewald, Heinrich, "*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Band III.," reviewed, 73.
- Exeter, Bishop of, "A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury," and "A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter," reviewed, 227.
- EXPULSION OF THE TRAFFICKERS FROM THE TEMPLE**, 211. Different accounts of the Synoptics and of John, 211. Equal difficulty of supposing two expulsions and one, 213. Difficulties of John's account, 213—of that in the Synoptics, 215. Alleged rule that no one should carry any vessel through the temple, 216. Quotation from the O. T. ascribed to Jesus, 217. Strauss' explanation of the story, 219. Can it be the outcome of a figurative expression of the results of Christ's preaching? 220. Instances of figurative language giving rise to legendary stories, 222. Objections to this interpretation considered, 224.
- Fox, W. J., "Memorial Edition of Collected Works of W. J. Fox," 413. Advisability of publishing only a selection of Fox's works, 414. Use of phraseology of older opinions, 415. Genius rather destructive than creative, 417. Fascinations of his style, 418. Early combativeness, 418. Use of the term Unitarian, 421. Sermons on the Christian Mission, 422. On Christ and Christianity, 423. On Gathering up the Fragments, 424. On Right and Expediency, 425. On the Three Ideas of Christianity, 426. On National Education, 427. On Moral Power, 428. On the Church Establishment, 429. Lectures on Morality, 430. Character of his eloquence, 433. Discourses

- on Death, 435. Agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws, 440. Position among the Unitarians, 441. Personal qualities, 442. In the House of Commons, 444. Contributions to the Westminster Review, 446. Qualities in society, 447.
- GILL, T. H., "The Papal Drama, a Historical Essay," noticed, 589.
- Gordon, John, "Christianity and Unitarianism" noticed, 468.
- GOSPEL QUESTION, THE. I. THE FOURTH GOSPEL, 264. Can the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel be reconciled? 264. Bretschneider's Probabilia, 265. Supposed authentication of the Gospels by the Church, 266. But the existence of the Church implies the authenticity of the Gospels, 267. The Gospel question stated, 268. Relation of the canonical to the apocryphal Gospels, 269. Historical importance of the authentication of the Gospels, 271. The inquiry commenced with the fourth Gospel, 272. Testimony of Irenæus, 273. Of Theophilus of Antioch, 276. Of the fragment of Muratori, 276. Tatian, 278. Athenagoras, 280. The Shepherd, 281. Letter of the churches in Vienna and Lugdunum, 281. The Sibylline Oracles, 282. Justin, 283. Polycarp, 289. Ignatius, 291. Clement of Rome, 292. Papias, 293. Conclusion, 294.
- GOSPEL QUESTION, THE. II. THE FOURTH GOSPEL. Conclusions brought forward from Part I., 564. Evidence from the style of the fourth Gospel, 565. Its Messianic expectations in strong contrast with those of the Apocalypse, 566. Data for estimating John's character, 566. His Judaizing spirit, 567. Authorship of the Apocalypse, 568. Phrases common to John's Gospel and Apocalypse, 569. Use in both of the phrases, "Son of Man" and "Son of God," 569. Figurative meaning given to water, 570. "They shall look upon him they have pierced," 571. Quotations from the old Scriptures, 572. The phrase, "Lamb of God," 574. "The Word" and "Word of God," 575. Remarkable omissions in the fourth Gospel, 577. Errors in the Gospel impossible to the apostle, 578. The argument from undesigned coincidences, 580. "Undesigned errors," 581. And "contradictions," 582. Suppression of John's name in the Gospel, 583. Pseudonymous literature, 584. How uncertainty and doubtfulness in the history is to be met, 585.
- Grenville, H., "Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels," noticed, 596.
- Guérin, Eugénie de, *Journal et Fragments*, reviewed, 501. *Lettres*, reviewed, 501.
- Guérin, Maurice de, *Journal, Lettres et Poèmes*, reviewed, 501.
- Guizot, "Meditations sur l'Etat Actuel de la Religion Chrétienne," noticed, 454.
- Guthrie, Thomas, D.D., "The Angel's Song," noticed, 814.
- HENNEL, Sarah S., "Present Religion, Part I.," noticed, 152.
- HERFORD, W. H., author of article, "Female Education in the Middle Classes," 526.
- Hincks, Thomas, B.A., "The New Catholic Movement," noticed, 597.
- Hopps, J. Page, "Verses by the Way," noticed, 158. "What do we as Unitarian Christians Believe?" 159. "The Symbolism of the Church," 464.
- Houghton, W., M.A., "An Essay on the Canticles," noticed, 155.
- "Hymnal Noted," reviewed, 227.
- "INSPIRATION," noticed, 159.
- IRELAND, UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN, 116. Demand in Parliament for a charter for the Catholic University, 116. Government proposition to affiliate it to the Queen's University, 117. Origin of the Queen's Colleges, 118. Of the Queen's University, 119. Dr. Cullen's opposition, 120. The Synod of Thurles and establishment of the Catholic University, 121. Are the Queen's Colleges a failure? 123. Proposal to remodel the higher education of Ireland

- on the pattern of the University of London, 127. Objections to this scheme, 129. University education reduced to a mere system of examinations, 131. Moral advantages of the collegiate system, 134. Especially in Ireland, 135. Ideal of a university system, 137. Results of university competition, 140. Clerical scheme of Irish university education, 142. Attempt to secure the control of Catholic university education for the Church, 147.
- Irving, Edward, *The Collected Writings of*, 5 vols., reviewed, 89.
- Irving, Edward, *Life of*, 4th edition, reviewed, 89.
- IRVING, EDWARD, 89. The dogmatic and scientific view of theology contrasted, 89. Theology and controversy not necessary to religion, 91. John Henry Newman and Edward Irving, 93. Personal influence of Irving, 95. Mrs. Oliphant's *Life of him*, 96. His birth and early life, 97. Ministry in London, 98. Criticism of edition of his collected works, 99. His devotion to the Kirk, 100. Repudiation of Calvinism, 101. Dread of liberal opinions, 102. Character of his eloquence, 102. Heresy on the human nature of Christ, 104. Study of prophecy and gifts of the Spirit, 106. New church formed, 108. Deposed for heresy, 109. Misstatement as to his relations to the new church, 110. Death, 113. Conclusion, 113.
- ISAIAH, THE PROPHET, 1. Supposed evangelical reference of *Ia. xxxv.*, 1. Is the whole book to be attributed to one author? 3. Age of Isaiah, 4. Chap. vi. belongs to the time of Uzziah, 5. First twelve chapters the oldest part of the collection, and refer exclusively to the Hebrew people, 5. Arrangement of them not chronological, 7. Their literary style, 8. Deeply religious spirit, 9. Chap. xiii. referring to Babylon, 11. Not the production of Isaiah, 11. Chaps. xiii.—xxiii. not chronologically arranged, 13. The larger part but not the whole of this section has the characteristics of Isaiah's style, 14. Chaps. xxiii.—xxvii. probably the production of a later writer, 16. Chaps. xxviii.—xxxiii. relate to Isaiah's time, 17. His writings concerned with the present or immediate future, 17.
- ISAIAH, THE LATER, 541. Modern discrimination between the earlier and later portions of Isaiah, 541. Traditional evidence against this, 542. Evidence from Jeremiah, 543. From Josephus, 544. From New-Testament writers, 545. Internal evidence of the book, 546. Difficulties attending the inquiry, 547. Opinions of the great German critics, 547. Convenience of the term "*Later Isaiah*," 548. The later portion written after the ruin of Judah, 549—and within sight of the deliverance, 551. True method of interpreting ancient records, 553. The prophet attacks Jewish idolatries, 553—and iniquities, 554. He was living amongst them, 555. He laments the delay of deliverance, 556. Peculiarities of his style, 557. The title, "*Servant of Jehovah*," 558—not applicable to Christ, 559—but to the whole captive people, 560—especially to the "*faithful few*," 561. The prophet identifies himself with the "*faithful servant*," 562. General conclusion, 564.
- JEVONS, WILLIAM, author of article, "*Expulsion of the Traffickers from the Temple*," 211.
- JEWISH CHURCH, HISTORY OF, 73. History of Israel the history of the Church, 73. Prospect of political greatness under David and Solomon, 75. Domestic life of Palestine at this era, 76. Revolt of Jeroboam and its motives, 79. Samuel and Saul, 80, 81. Character of David, 82. Were Jeroboam's golden calves intended to represent the true God? 84. Merits and defects of Dean Stanley's work, 86.
- KIRKMAN, T. P., M.A., F.R.S., "*Three Lectures*," noticed, 315.
- LAYMAN'S "*Faith, Doctrines and Liturgy*," noticed, 595.
- Lee, F. G., D.C.L., "*The Directorium Anglicanum*," reviewed, 227.
- Liefde, John de, "*Six Months among the Charities of Europe*," reviewed, 49.

- M'COSH, James, LL.D.**, "An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy," &c., noticed, 456.
- Maginnis, David**, "Unitarians vindicated against Misrepresentations," noticed, 598.
- MARTINEAU, JAMES**, author of article, "The Living Church through Changing Creeds," 296.
- Merivale, Charles, B.D.**, "The Conversion of the Northern Nations," noticed, 307.
- NATAL, Bishop of**, "Correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Capetown," 463. "Two Sermons," 463.
- Newman, J. H., D.D.**, "Parochial Sermons," "Sermons on Subjects of the Day," "A Letter to Dr. Pusey on his Kirenicon," reviewed, 227.
- Nicholson, N. A., M.A.**, "E pur si Muove," noticed, 457.
- Noailles, Anne Paule Dominique de**, Life of, reviewed, 501.
- Noyes, G. R., D.D.**, "A New Translation of the Hebrew Prophets," noticed, 448.
- OAKLEY, F.**, "A Letter to Archbishop Manning on the Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work," reviewed, 227.
- PAUL, C. KEGAN, B.A.**, author of article, "Edward Irving," 89. Of article, "Ernest Renan—Les Apôtres," 389.
- PIETY, CHARACTERISTICS OF ROMAN CATHOLIC**, 501. Distinctive features of Protestant and Catholic piety, 502. Sketch of the De Guérin family, 503. Maurice de Guérin, 504. Eugénie de Guérin, a Catholic of the Catholics, 506. Her piety, nevertheless, almost wholly monotheistic, 506. Sketch of the d'Ayen family, 507. Anne Paule Dominique de Noailles, 507. She marries De Montagu, 507. French Revolution, 509. De Montagu and his wife take refuge in England, 510. Madame de Montagu joins her aunt in Switzerland, 511. Madame de Teseé, 512. Reign of Terror, 512. Swiss inhospitality to French emigrants, 513. Death of Madame de Montagu, 515. Directive influence of the Roman Catholic Church, 516. Her grasp upon the future, 518. Her religious life a discipline rather than an aspiration, 519. Functions of the confessor, 520. The church and the world from a Catholic point of view, 521. Sectarianism of the Roman Catholic Church, 523. Her view of life, 524. Secret of the Catholic's contempt for danger, 525. Antagonism to the free spirit of the age, 525. Contrast between Catholic and Protestant forms of saintliness, 526.
- Plumptre, E. H., M.A.**, "Theology and Life," noticed, 312.
- "Poems of the Inner Life," noticed, 157.
- Powell, Baden, M.A.**, "Christianity without Judaism," noticed, 464.
- Pressensé, Ed. de**, "Jesus-Christ," noticed, 308.
- RELIGION OF CHILDHOOD, THE**, 317. Future of dogmatic belief according to M. Renan, 317. Opposite view, 318. Influence of religious error and truth upon the mind, 319. What religion shall we teach our children? 321. Common Unitarian theory of letting children choose a religion for themselves, 323. Difficulties in this respect of Theists not members of Unitarian churches, 324. Critical spirit ought not to be fostered in a child, 325. Children ought not to be taught sharply-cut doctrines about God, 326. Love a datum of a child's nature, 328. Sense of sin, 328. Parents must teach what they believe to be true, 331. Must teach didactically, 332. Trials of Sunday, 334. Bible-reading, 335. Church-going, 336. Presentation of God to a child's mind as an Object of natural love, 338.
- RENAN, ERNEST—LES APÔTRES**, 389. General sympathy with the intellectual spirit of the book, 390; but not with his deliberate recommendation of dis-

- honesty, 393. His theory of the Resurrection, 396. Criticism of it, 399. Acts of the Apostles and its authorship, 401. Different value of its earlier and latter portions, 403. M. Renan's low estimate of the apostles, 405. Conversion of St. Paul, 408. Paul and Barnabas, 411.
- Réville, Albert, D.D., "Life and Writings of Theodore Parker," noticed, 596.
- RITUALISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 227. Ritualism has its root in Catholic theology, 229. Opposition between Catholic and Rationalistic parties fundamental, 229. Autobiographical retrospect, 230. First awakening from Evangelicism, 230. Duty of making God's worship glorious, 232. Importance of the idea of the Eucharist, 234. Symbolism of worship, 237. Division of the High-church party, 239. The Romish and the Rationalistic sections, 240. Rapid development of ritualism in a third section, 242. Prominence given to the Eucharistic celebration, 242. Doctrine of a Real Presence, 244. Results of this belief in ritual practice, 249. According to the ritualists, the Church of England really Catholic, 252. Comprehensive theory of the Church, 253. Appeal to the law of the Church difficult and unsatisfactory, 255. Mariolatry of ritualism, 260. Sacerdotal stronger than the Puritan party in the Church, 262. Is it lawful for a clergyman to believe that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation? 263. Possible results of raising this question, 263.
- "Ritualism and the Ecclesiastical Law," Contemporary Review, Jan. 1866, reviewed, 227.
- ROBERTSON'S LIFE AND LETTERS, 21. Cloudy but pure propheta, 22. Robertson's a name of power in the religious world, 22. Reticence of his biographer as to his private and family affairs, 23. Outline of life, 24, 25. History of his religious opinions, 26. Early Evangelical impressions, 27. Military predilections, 28. Curacy at Winchester, 28. At Cheltenham, 30. Struggle to shake off Evangelicism, 31. Curacy at Oxford, 34. Incumbency of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 34. Form of Christ-worship peculiar to Robertson, 36. Different degrees of love to Christ not dependent upon theological belief, 36. General theological relations of Christ-worship, 38. Robertson's power of discerning living truth in fossil dogmas, 41. Sporting tastes, 45. Feelings about women, 46. Depressed spirits, 47. Parallel with Theodore Parker, 48.
- SCOTLAND, THE THEOLOGICAL POSITION IN, 362. Not to be understood except on the supposition of a sincere religious life, 363. Petition to the General Assembly for maintaining the Westminster Confession, 364. Opinions of Dr. Macleod, Duke of Argyll and Dr. Tulloch, 365. Strongest tendency to relax subscription in the National Church, 367. Dr. R. Lee's view of subscription, 368. Dr. Tulloch's, 369. Criticism of their arguments, 370. What hope of widening the Church? 374. Necessity of subscription to obtain a vote in the Church courts, 375. Address of Moderator of Free Church Assembly, 377. Of Chairman of Congregational Union, 379. Sabbath question, 383. Organ question in the National Church, 384. Proposed union of Free with United Presbyterian Church, 386. Hymn question in the Free Church, 388.
- Selwyn, William, B.D., "Notes on the proposed Amendment of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures," reviewed, 188.
- Sharpe, Samuel, "The Hebrew Scriptures translated, Vol. III.," noticed, 154.
- Shipley, Orby, M.A., "The Divine Liturgy," &c., reviewed, 227.
- SMITH, EDWIN, M.A., author of article, "The Charities of Europe," 49.
- SMITH, GEORGE VANCE, B.A., Ph.D., author of article, "The Prophet Isaiah," 1. Of article, "The Later Isaiah," 541.
- Smith, Southwood, M.D., "The Divine Government," noticed, 464.
- "SON OF GOD," CONSIDERED AS A TITLE OF THE MESSIAH, 465. Christianity

- the result of Hebrew united to Hellenic thought, 465. Critical value of the Greek Gospels, 466. Legendary elements of the New Testament, 466. Matthew preferable as an authority, 467. Assumption that "Son of David" and "Son of God" are equally applied to the Messiah, 468. The phrase not so applied in the Old Testament, 469. Messianic verse in the second Psalm, 469. Jewish Apocalyptic books, 470. Fourth Book of Ezra, 470. Enoch, 471. Use of the title in Matthew's Gospel, 471. Only "Son of David" probably used during the lifetime of Jesus, 472. The phrase "Son of God" unknown before Paul's preaching, 474. Evidence of the book of Acts, 475. The book of Revelation, 478. Real origin and import of the phrase, 479. Teachings of Philo and the Alexandrine school, 482. Their influence upon Paul, 482. Galatians ii. 20, the key to the Pauline theology, 483. Peculiarity of Paul's relation to Christ, 484. Résumé of arguments adduced, 485.
- Stanley, A. P., D.D., "Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, Pt. II.," reviewed, 73.
- Strauss, D. F., "A new Life of Jesus," authorized translation, noticed, 157.
- Street, J. C., "The Night-side of Newcastle," noticed, 159.
- TATLER, J. J., B.A., "Confirmation Address at Nottingham," noticed, 598.
- Thom, J. H., "The Church of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus," noticed, 597.
- "Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed, by a Layman," noticed, 460.
- Tischendorf, Æn. F. C., "Novum Testamentum Græce Ed. Octava," reviewed, 188.
- "Truth and Opinion, a Letter to J. E. Howard, Esq.," noticed, 597.
- VAUGHAN, C. J., D.D., "Christ the Light of the World," noticed, 311.
- "Vivisection: two Prize Essays," noticed, 599.
- Voysey, Charles, B.A., "The Sling and the Stone," Pts. I.—V., 315. Pts. VI.—VIII., 463.
- WICKSTEED, Charles, "The One God and Father of All," noticed, 597.
- Williams, Rowland, D.D., "The Hebrew Prophets, translated afresh," Vol. I., noticed, 448.
- Wolfe, Arthur, M.A., "A Plea for the Revision of the Prayer-book and of the A. V. of the Bible," noticed, 316. "Family Prayers and Scripture Calendar," noticed, 596.
- YOUNG, John, LL.D., "The Life and Light of Men," noticed, 457.
- ZELLER, R., "Strauss and Renan," noticed, 460.

